

controlling interest in two banks as well as extensive agricultural interests.

In the face of these numerous exemptions, exclusions, and special provisions, how can it be argued that there is a serious public interest question involved in the mixed ownership of both banking and nonbanking assets? Taken together these exemptions relieve all but a very few bank holding companies of the prohibitions on combined ownership of both banking and nonbanking assets. If there were a realistic need for this punitive divestiture requirement there could be no justification for these numerous exclusions and exemptions. If there is not, we should treat all bank holding companies alike by permitting them to retain their lawfully acquired and presently owned nonbanking holdings.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to further amendment.

**Mr. ROBERTSON.** Mr. President, I move that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 6227, and that the Senate proceed to consider the House bill.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6227) to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes.

**Mr. ROBERTSON.** Mr. President, I move that all after the enacting clause of the bill be stricken out; and that there be inserted, in lieu thereof, the text of Senate bill 2577, as amended.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill having been read the third time, the question now is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 6227) was passed.

**Mr. ROBERTSON.** Mr. President, I move that the title of House bill 6227 be amended so as to make it conform to the title of Senate bill 2577.

The motion was agreed to; and the title was amended so as to read: "A bill to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests."

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, Senate bill 2577 is indefinitely postponed.

#### AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, AS AMENDED

**Mr. JOHNSON of Texas.** Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1755, Senate bill 3025.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

**THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (S. 3025) to amend paragraph (2) of sub-

division (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments.

#### CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

**Mr. JOHNSON of Texas.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, following completion of the morning business, there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of the measures to which there is no objection, beginning at the point where the last call of the calendar was concluded.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS FROM THURSDAY UNTIL MONDAY

**Mr. JOHNSON of Texas.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business on tomorrow, it stand in recess until Monday noon.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM— ADJOURNMENT

**Mr. JOHNSON of Texas.** Mr. President, I have made the request for the Senate to take a recess from the conclusion of its business on tomorrow until Monday next, so that all my colleagues may be on notice.

On tomorrow we shall take up the measures which were announced earlier in the day; and we hope we may be able to complete action on all of them. Then we shall go over until Monday.

On Monday, we shall have a call of the calendar.

After conferring with the distinguished minority leader, I shall announce the program for later in that week. I hope the committees will report additional measures to the Senate.

**Mr. President,** pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 26, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of April 24), 1956:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Albert F. Nufer, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines, vice Homer Ferguson.

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career

minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina, vice Albert F. Nufer.

Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Chile, vice Willard L. Beaulac.

##### INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Andrew N. Overby, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years. (Reappointment.)

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast made us for Thyself, grant that during the hours of this day we may be guided by Thy Holy Spirit in the ways of truth and strengthened for every task.

Thou knowest how frequently we are beset by fears and doubts which rob us of peace and assailed by worries and weaknesses which undermine our character and corrupt the spirit within.

Enable us by Thy grace to cultivate a faith that is calm and may we never waver when tempted to any unworthy action.

Deepen and increase among mankind the spirit of neighborliness and helpfulness that in times of peril we may uphold one another, in calamity serve one another, in sorrow comfort one another, and in suffering and distress encourage one another.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5265) entitled "An act to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. KERR, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7247) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganiza-

tions," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56-12.

#### THE CHELSEA (MASS.) RECORD WINS NATIONAL GUARD AWARD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, alert and public-spirited newspapers form the backbone of our democracy. Our Nation could not function without them. They not only keep our people well informed with their objective coverage of the news; their editorial comment which helps to clarify the issues on local, State, National, and worldwide levels; and their advertising service which links consumers and producers in the dynamic progress of our society; but give freely of their space to many worthy causes.

In fact, Government itself is dependent upon them to spread information concerning its needs and services. In time of war or national emergency, this cooperation is vital.

This voluntary and patriotic service on the part of our newspapers deserves special recognition.

It is with pride that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a noteworthy instance of this public service on the part of the Chelsea Record, the daily newspaper of the city of Chelsea in Massachusetts.

A photograph in its issue of April 10, 1956, pictures Fred L. Gillis, military editor of the Chelsea Record, accepting the National Guard meritorious plaque from Capt. Samuel J. Leavis, Jr., of the 772d AAA Gun Battalion, Massachusetts National Guard, during the recent National Guard show put on by the local guard unit. The principal figure in the citation shows an emblazoned eagle with a shield on which are the words:

The National Guard Bureau meritorious service plaque awarded in recognition of your patriotic service and meritorious support of the National Guard.

The citation states the plaque is in recognition of outstanding service to the defense efforts of the Army and Air National Guard Bureau. Captain Leavis recommended the citation because of the support given the National Guard by the Chelsea Record in its news coverage and editorial especially during the unit's an-

nual tour of duty and more recently in the move to have a new armory erected.

To which we add our special accolade for distinguished service, to the Chelsea Record.

#### SOIL-BANK PLAN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, April 19, I said on the floor of the House that the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture "can demonstrate again his great statesmanship by putting aside all differences over the recently vetoed bill and come forward with the soil-bank plan."

I was happy to learn that yesterday the chairman had introduced a soil-bank plan and intends to proceed with this bill as soon as possible. This is a wonderful gesture on his part. I am sure he realized that it was not possible for either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture to implement a comprehensive or overall soil-bank plan without more legislation than presently exists.

I know we all have the highest regard for the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] who on Monday this week placed in the RECORD existing legislation by which he felt the Secretary could put into effect the soil-bank plan.

I have reviewed carefully the gentleman's excerpts from existing law. I believe I have given careful scrutiny to all of it. I have talked with two legal experts on legislation. They advise me that there are some minor things which the President could do with the existing legislation, but that by no stretch of the imagination could the President institute the kind of soil-bank plan which was contained in the recently vetoed farm bill. In my opinion the soil-bank provisions of that bill were comprehensive enough that the good of the soil-bank plan could have been accomplished.

If my understanding is correct, much of the bill introduced by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee will follow the provisions of that bill which I am sure the great majority of the House would be willing to accept.

There are some provisions not in the chairman's bill which I hope he will be willing to add. One of these would include the prepayment idea outlined in the President's radio speech of some time ago. I am sure the chairman is just as anxious to bring forward legislation to help the farmer as he is the President. Their approach is slightly different. However, I do believe that the prepaid plan has considerable merit and of course would have the additional benefit of aiding the farmer early in the growing season.

Last night in the forepart of the Evening Star I was somewhat disappointed to read the following about the distinguished majority leader in the other body. I quote:

The Texan obliquely served notice that the Democratic-controlled Congress does not in-

tend to comply with President Eisenhower's request for soil-bank legislation.

However, when I turned to page 6 of the Evening Star and read in detail the speech made by the majority leader in the other body, I did not find that he said anything to that effect. What he did say is as follows and I quote him:

I think President Eisenhower can rest assured that the Congress will give him \$1,200,000,000 to set up the soil bank.

If I understand the majority leader of the other body correctly, he has inferred that he is in favor of granting the President the necessary money to institute a soil-bank plan. The majority leader was under the same impression as our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]—that the President already had authority to set up the soil-bank plan.

I believe that within the next few days both of these gentlemen will become convinced by legal opinion impartially rendered that the President cannot institute a soil-bank plan with only existing legislation.

In that case I think that the majority leader in the other body will come to the same viewpoint as our distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee—that legislation for a comprehensive and overall soil-bank plan should be passed by this Congress and put into effect as soon as possible. If that is done there will be no question about the authority of either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture to proceed legally with the soil-bank idea.

There has been a lot said about politics in farm legislation. I do not know that I am any seer in this matter. However, it does appear to me that the soil-bank plan has been studied thoroughly by almost every agricultural expert and economist of any consequence and it has received almost unanimous approval.

From this I believe that anyone who attempted to block or to hinder the institution of this important and needed farm legislation would certainly receive deserved censure from the farm population.

I voted for the vetoed farm bill and voted to override the President's veto, because I believed that the real heart of that farm bill was the soil-bank plan. The soil-bank plan is the only measure that has been introduced or suggested since I have been in Congress by which we can hope to reduce agricultural surpluses to somewhat balanced demand without lowering the farmers' income. More than that, it is a democratically operated plan which provides an incentive method to the farmer to reduce his acreage without loss of income. It does not impose any fiat or Government control upon him to comply—only voluntary compliance is provided by this legislation.

I hope that the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture will start hearings on this bill as soon as possible and that a bill will be forthcoming without too much delay.

It appears to me that cooperation on this measure in the interests of the farm population generally should be non-partisan and when it comes to a vote it is



my prediction that any reasonable soil-bank plan will carry overwhelmingly. I am sure that political credit, if any is needed, will be spread equally among those who are responsible for the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we do badly need this legislation now.

#### ACCIDENTS ON PUBLIC HIGHWAYS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the next several days, Congress will in all likelihood pass out a \$51 billion highway bill to bring about needed improvements in the interstate system of highways. I am in hearty accord with this legislation.

However, it is my sincere hope that this improved highway system will not become an interstate escape route for valuable American life.

During 1955 there were 37,800 highway deaths, 2,300 more than in 1954, with excessive speed as the principal cause. In addition, there were 2,158,000 injuries—198,000 more than in 1954. Seven hundred fifteen thousand two hundred sixty of the casualties were the result of speeding.

The current trend in automobile promotion is horsepower and speed. The development of high torque and fuel injection engines, pushbutton driving, and increased horsepower has not contributed one iota to the brainpower behind the wheel. Kamikaze driving has become a fashionable American pastime.

I wish to call the attention to the following advertisement on a DeSoto Adventurer automobile which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on April 18, 1956:

On display now—320 horsepower DeSoto Adventurer. You've never seen or driven the likes of the new 320 horsepower DeSoto Adventurer. See this beautiful package of golden dynamite.

In a large block this ad states further: Electronically clocked at the scorching speed of 137 miles per hour.

The following ad is appearing currently for Pontiac:

Meet the new boss—all-new stratoflight hydramatic especially for Pontiac's high-stepping Strato-Streak powerplant. The blazing action of 227 horses is yours in a flash.

Right here is the team that puts you in a performance class all by yourself. You're driving the one that's been clocked from 9 to 60 in 10 seconds flat.

Chrysler recently announced a model with 340 horsepower which is labeled the fastest commercial automobile with a clocked speed of 147 miles per hour.

What kind of a fool would want to drive an automobile on our public highways at 147 miles per hour or accelerate from 0 to 60 miles per hour in 10 seconds flat? These advertisements are designed to appeal to the highway idiot.

J. Edgar Hoover recently stated that parents should be held accountable and legally responsible for the crimes of their

children. By the same principle, the automobile manufacturers might well be held equally responsible for the attractive and destructive toys they are willing to place in the hands of anyone who has a down payment and knows how to make his mark for perpetual indebtedness on a cognovit note.

I recommend the appointment of a congressional committee to conduct hearings and make recommendations on highway design and construction, highway use including the safety and power specifications of the modern automobile as well as ways and means of abating the loss of life on our public highways. This is a vital Federal problem in every sense of the word and should be considered now as we vote upon improving our highway system.

#### CERTAIN RELATIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 457) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "Chamberis", insert "Olga P. Cheek."

Page 2, line 6, after "Corra", insert "Nicola G. D'Armi."

Page 2, line 7, after "Falcone", insert "Anna G. Favla."

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, after "Gasparatos", insert "Lilli Gerlisky."

Page 2, line 9, after "Gibson", insert "Lieselotte W. Grimmer."

Page 2, line 10, after "Israel", insert "Efstathios Katsikis."

Page 2, line 10, after "Kikel", insert "Hedwig B. Krause."

Page 2, line 10, after "Kikel", insert "Gertrud H. E. T. Kruger."

Page 2, line 10, after "Labellarte", insert "Margaret W. Lampinen."

Page 2, line 11, after "Larson", insert "Chieko S. Lee."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "Elfriede Luker."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "Maria McWalters", and insert "Marianne Putz McWalters."

Page 2, line 15, after "Mavromatis", insert "Tatjana Meerman."

Page 2, line 21, after "Pantera", insert "Armaranti N. Papanikitas."

Page 2, line 21, after "Pantera", insert "Maria M. Regina."

Page 2, line 21, after "Ruschak", insert "Anna Sagan."

Page 3, line 1, after "Wilson", insert "Brian Woo."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PENALTIES APPLICABLE TO SEDITION CONSPIRACY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2854) to amend title 18 of the United States Code,

so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. Celler, Mr. Walter, Mr. Feighan, Mr. Keating, and Miss Thompson of Michigan.

#### ELECTED OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 486) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved* That, effective May 1, 1956, (1) the annual gross compensation of the elected officers of the House shall be as follows: Clerk of the House, \$17,500 per annum; Sergeant at Arms, \$17,500 per annum; Doorkeeper, \$16,500 per annum; and Postmaster, \$14,500 per annum; and (2) the annual gross compensation of the minority employees of the House holding positions now held by Lyle O. Snader, William R. Bonsell, Tom J. Kennamer, and Beecher Hess shall be respectively \$15,000 per annum, \$15,000 per annum, \$12,500 per annum, and \$11,000 per annum.

The additional amounts necessary to carry out this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1957

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 484 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 33]

Bell	Davis, Tenn.	Haley
Bowler	Dawson, Ill.	Harris
Boykin	Diggs	Hays, Ohio
Brooks, La.	Donovan	Hébert
Byrnes, Wis.	Eberharter	Hess
Chatham	Fulton	Hiestand
Chudoff	Gamble	Hoffman, Ill.
Clark	Grant	Hollfield
Cole	Green, Oreg.	Jarman

Johnson, Calif.	Machrowicz	Phillips
Kelley, Pa.	Martin	Pillion
Kelly, N. Y.	Matthews	Powell
Kilburn	Metcalf	Shelley
Knox	Miller, Calif.	Sieminski
Knutson	Mollohan	Staggers
McConnell	Morgan	Williams, N. Y.
McCulloch	O'Hara, Minn.	Willis
McDowell	Patman	Wolverton

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### NEVER A SOUND REASON

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at every opportunity during the Easter recess, an effort was made by repeated inquiries of individuals and at public meetings, to find a reason for the opposition to Nixon as the Republican Vice Presidential candidate.

The only answer was given by a young man at a public meeting who, when pressed, said: "Nixon cried." When asked when and where, he said "when Nixon appeared on television and answered the charge that he had been dishonest when he accepted and used for the dissemination of information contributions sent in by some of his constituents."

Personally, I do not recall that Nixon cried or wept on that occasion. But if he did, see St. John 11:35. I do remember that he had been most unfairly criticized by a large segment of the press because some of his constituents, approving of his thinking and actions as a Member of Congress, furnished funds to assist him in publicizing some of his views. At least I think that was the purpose.

If Nixon did do any crying or weeping on that occasion, it is not difficult to understand, to realize that any normal individual viciously and without reason assailed as was he, would either shed a tear or do a little cursing. If he let his emotions get the better of him, the exhibition was nothing more nor less than a demonstration that, like the rest of us, he was human; that he resented, as would every normal individual, such a vicious, unreasonable charge as was then made.

I should have suggested to Nixon's critic that if he could sometime watch Nixon at breakfast he might discover that the Vice President had spilled a drop or two of his coffee in the saucer.

All of which brings me to the following editorial in the April 28 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, and to the firm conviction that Dick Nixon is not only suitable Vice Presidential but Presidential timber.

Perhaps it is gilding the lily to add that the character of his opposition but further proves that the country needs him.

THE CRUSADE AGAINST NIXON SEEMS TO HAVE RUN INTO SOMETHING OF A ROADBLOCK

First off, let us explain that we are not shilling for Mr. RICHARD NIXON. We are content to leave the choice of a Republican vice presidential candidate to the San Francisco convention.

However, the whispering, not to mention shouting, campaign against the Vice President persists, although the Vice President's

startling strength in the New Hampshire primary last month and his virtual endorsement by President Eisenhower and many prominent Republicans, including a few who had been falsely identified with the "Dump Dick" movement, have put a serious crimp in it.

Men more or less like Nixon have often appeared in American politics, and although they have usually been involved in plenty of political fighting, and have often made blobs as startling as Nixon's reference to a "great Republican, Chief Justice Warren," few have been subjected to as much high-toned smearing as has been heaped upon Nixon. Why has all this happened to Nixon and not to other public officials of similar backgrounds and ambitions?

The "liberals" who don't like Mr. Nixon give all sorts of reasons why: his "brashness," his partisan attacks on the Democrats and so on. They usually ignore the Alger Hiss case, and Nixon's insistence on pressing it when the columnists, the Park Avenue set and members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities itself believed that Hiss was a malignant man.

In a frankly laudatory biography of Nixon (Henry Holt Co.) Ralph de Toledano recalls the atmosphere which prevailed on August 5, 1948, after Hiss had completed his rebuttal to testimony by Whittaker Chambers that Hiss had been a member of a Communist cell in the United States Government.

"When Hiss stepped off the stand," writes Mr. de Toledano, "there was a general rush of newspapermen and committee members to shake his hand." Nixon smelled a rat.

But the disclosures of Communist espionage have put the whammy on any Member of Congress courageous enough to tackle the problem. That is what happened to Nixon.

Undoubtedly there are people who wouldn't like Nixon if he were as "liberal" as Robert Maynard Hutchins—just as others, who don't like him very much, are for Nixon on account of his anti-Communist record. But the smear campaign against Nixon is kept alive by those who demand the heads of all who fight communism effectively. One thing we can be sure of is that the stockpile of dead cats for Mr. Nixon has not been exhausted.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 484 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 10721, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year 1957.

The resolution provides that all points of order against the bill shall be waived.

The total recommended in the bill is \$541,367,372. Of this amount \$171,506,737 is provided for the Department of State. This is a reduction of \$9,700,548 in the amount of the budget estimates. Ninety million is for Foreign Service administration, including expenses and salaries for "government in occupied areas," which heretofore has been appropriated for separately. Approximately \$22 million is appropriated for representation allowances for officers of the Foreign Service, acquisition of buildings abroad, funds to cover emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service and the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund. The amount for contributions to international organizations is \$33,830,875 which includes the contribution

to NATO for \$1,150,000. Sixteen million one hundred and eight thousand three hundred and eighty-nine dollars is for the United Nations. The appropriation also covers funds for Missions to International Organizations, the International Boundary and Water Commission, and the International Fisheries Commission.

The amount recommended in the bill for the Department of Justice is \$215,965,000—a reduction of \$19,915,000 in the amount of the budget estimates. This covers legal activities and general administration, the FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Federal Prison System.

The appropriation for the operation of the Federal courts, including salaries of judges, judicial officials and employees, and other expenses of the Federal judiciary amounts to \$35,395,635—\$2,186,900 below the total amount requested; \$1,527,785 of this amount is for the Supreme Court.

The bill also provides funds for the United States Information Agency in the amount of \$110 million; \$8,500,000 for the operation of the refugee relief program from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, as requested by the President, and \$950,000 for the Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

I urge the adoption of this resolution so the House may proceed to the consideration of this appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. While the gentleman told us how much these estimates have been cut, I should like to ask how much this bill has been cut compared with the spending of last year.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. ROONEY] to answer that question.

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to the Department of State, there is an increase to the extent of \$24,258,042. With regard to the Department of Justice there is an increase to the extent of \$4,893,000. With regard to the Judiciary, there is an increase to the extent of \$1,479,725. With regard to the Information Agency, there is an increase of \$22,663,730. With regard to refugee relief, there is a decrease from the amount for this purpose last year in the amount of \$6.5 million. So that in the four principal items in the bill I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, frankly, there have been increases. However, the committee made reductions in the amount of the budget estimates, which deductions amount to \$56,802,448.

There was presented a requested substantial increase in funds for the information agency. They wanted the sum of \$135 million. While the committee in unanimous agreement cut the amount to \$110 million, a cut of \$25 million, nevertheless there was an allowed increase to the extent of over \$22 million.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from the Committee on Rules tell me why points of order are waived on this bill?

Mr. DELANEY. Yes. I will again ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations to explain that.



Mr. ROONEY. There are a number of items in this bill that have been carried over a number of years. They never have been objected to. It is sought to protect them by waiving points of order.

However, there are three new items that would be covered by the waiver of points of order.

The first is in connection with the State Department, with regard to the payment of tort claims in the manner authorized by the first paragraph of section 2672 as amended by title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries. This provision would merely permit the Department of State in the event of an automobile accident or some other tort claim abroad to have the same authority which the United States Information Agency and the International Cooperation Administration now have, giving the Secretary of State or his designee overseas the right to settle such claims up to the amount of \$1,000 without a great deal of redtape.

The second item concerns a confidential fund, an unvouchered fund, for the Attorney General, in the amount of \$5,000, to be used in connection with getting information and the usual purposes of such a fund in the hands of a law-enforcement officer in the Territory of Alaska. There the United States Marshals comprise a great part of the law-enforcement system. Because of the fact that they have not been successful in instances because of their failure to have unvouchered funds, the committee thought it proper to allow the insertion of this language, "including not to exceed \$5,000 for emergencies to be accounted for solely on the certificate of the Attorney General."

The third item concerns three positions, raising them to the grade of GS-16. At the present time and for some time there have been five assistant commissioners of immigration. Three of these commissioners for at least the past year have been in grade GS-16. About a month ago the Congress saw fit to permit two retired generals, Generals Howard and Partridge, to accept the positions of assistant commissioners of immigration. This inserted language would put them on the same basis as the other three commissioners, so that all five assistant commissioners would receive the uniform salary of GS-16. In their case the salary increase would amount to less than \$2,600 for both.

There is one other position included, that of the district director of immigration in New York, Mr. Edward J. Shaughnessy. For many, many years Ed Shaughnessy has been a very faithful servant of the Federal Government. In his case the increase would amount to not more than \$1,000 and would give him a GS-16 grade.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying the proper legislative committees are incompetent to handle these matters?

Mr. ROONEY. I am not saying that at all, but in the three specific instances to which I referred I think something should be done and done promptly. There is no telling when it might be done otherwise.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In the inclusion of these amounts over and above what was appropriated before the committee did not have in mind any thought that that might make it impossible to balance the budget or get a reduction in the income tax?

Mr. DELANEY. Again I will refer that question to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY. I can assure the gentleman from Michigan that that is not so. I have spent a number of years here now trying to save some money for the taxpayers. But it appears that in 1953 when the new administration came into office they cut the State Department and Foreign Service too drastically. I protested it at that time. We must have proper and adequate representation all over the world to protect the interests of this Government and its security.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am happy to know that that side of the aisle is supporting the President again.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield.

Mr. WIER. Following the position taken by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], I also want to comment and express my opposition to this rule waiving all points of order. To me, this is a sneaker here.

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, then, through you.

Mr. DELANEY. Then I yield to the chairman for that purpose.

Mr. WIER. This provision written in this bill on page 22 dealing with these five new positions which are created is not in compliance with the position of the Committee on Armed Services which was taken a couple of weeks ago when these were presumed to be temporary positions and not in competition with career employees. But here you have frozen them in competition with career employees.

Mr. ROONEY. No. May I say the gentleman is in error. The increase to grade 16 refers to only 3 positions and not 5, or 6, as the language says, for the reason that 3 of the 6 are already by law grade 16. This language would make the 5 assistant commissioners uniform as to grades and amount of compensation.

Mr. WIER. The fact remains that the 2 generals will undoubtedly be included in these 5. I think that is what the bill is passed for. Let us call a spade a spade. You are making provision in this bill for these 2 generals on a permanent basis.

Mr. ROONEY. I thought I very frankly pointed that out. The committee was unanimous in feeling that there was no reason that 3 assistant commissioners should be grade 16 and 2 should be grade 15. This makes them uniform. That is all it does, and the amount involved is in the neighborhood of \$2,600.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to advise the Members of the House that tomorrow the highway-construction bill will come up. It will be voted on Friday. We will probably meet early on Friday. I am making this announcement so the Members can govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of the time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has explained the bill which this resolution will make in order. I can only add that this resolution is somewhat different from such resolutions as have been brought to the floor by the Committee on Rules on ordinary legislative bills in that the time is not specified in the rule. The time, as I understand it, is to be agreed to by the chairman and the ranking member of the committee, with the unanimous consent of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] 10 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is shocking and almost beyond belief that the Rules Committee should approve a rule on this appropriations bill waiving all points of order.

Let it be remembered that it was only a few short weeks ago that the Rules Committee waived points of order on the independent offices appropriation bill and by so doing started a controversy to which I desire to direct your attention because it bears on exactly the same kind of legislation as is contained in this measure.

First, let me reemphasize that there can be only one reason for a rule waiving points of order on an appropriation bill and that is for the purpose of nullifying the prohibition against legislation on an appropriation measure. There would be no necessity for this rule if that were not the case. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill and the leadership of this House, Democrats and Republicans alike, know this to be the truth.

And let me say this to the members of the Rules Committee—by the increasing frequency with which you are granting these waivers, you are making a mockery of the standing legislative committees and stultifying the prestige of your own committee. You are becoming parties to an expediency that will, if persisted in, break down the legislative process.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee of which I am a member, and a subcommittee of which I am also a member, has been attempting to keep some balance of super grade employees in the Federal Government. This subcommittee is headed by one of the most distinguished and hard working Members of Congress, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

When the Independent Offices appropriation bill was before the House on March 6 of this year, it provided 11

supergrade employees for the General Services Administration. In order to slip through this legislation on that appropriation bill, the Rules Committee waived points of order. Now comes the Appropriations Committee with 5 more supergrade employees through the process of legislation in the pending State and Justice Department appropriations bill.

The provisions of the Classification Act, under which 1,200 supergrade positions under control of the Civil Service Commission are allocated, requires that each of these positions be analyzed in detail as to responsibilities and duties, and that they be completely justified as individual positions and in their relationship to all other positions in the Federal Government. The final authority for the allocation of these positions is a majority of the three Commissioners of the Civil Service Commission.

In the debate on the independent offices appropriation bill on Tuesday, March 6, 1956, the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the subcommittee handling that legislation, stated, and I quote:

The Civil Service Commission has 74 of those jobs over there unallocated, but they, frankly, told us at 10:30 this morning that there are 600 applicants throughout the Government for the 74.

I further quote from the remarks of the gentleman from California, the Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS:

All I can say is that this is a reasonable and an honest and a deserving attempt on the part of this subcommittee to adjust the supergrades among 18 agencies that come before us, to see that one man who is doing a more responsible job than are the men in the other agencies holding comparable jobs, is entitled to the same salary that other people get who are doing a less responsible job.

Did these gentlemen consider in any way the other 600 applicants for the 74 available positions when they allocated the 11 supergrades to the General Services Administration? I also ask them did they take the time necessary to thoroughly analyze the duties and responsibilities of each of the 11 jobs they so casually allocated? Did they review the job sheet of a single one of them? I further ask if they feel that if their committee, or any committee of Congress, should usurp the authorities and responsibilities not only of other House committees but the executive branch of Government as well, and attempt to classify and allocate the individual positions in the Federal Government?

I further quote from the RECORD of Tuesday, March 6, to show that the Committee on Appropriations did give some consideration to the allocation of these supergrade jobs. On page 4077 I quote from the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]:

What we are doing is the sensible business like thing. Here is a group of men who spend from two hundred to four or five hundred millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money of this country. We think it is good business to pay men with such responsibility a sufficient amount so that there is not going to be any question of defalcation.

I further quote from the remarks of the honorable gentleman from Texas as they appear on page 4090 of the RECORD:

These people spend millions and millions of dollars. Is it right to have a man given authority to spend \$50 million of \$100 million and put him on a little bit of a salary? You want to keep him honest, do you not?

It seems to me that the only consideration given to justifying the allocation of 11 supergrade positions to the General Services Administration was that of keeping the employees honest. If the pay and classification schedules of the Federal Government are to be based on the relative honesty of the incumbents, I say that this Congress should no longer be concerned with any law establishing rules and regulations for the placing of positions in their relative order of importance and with the pay of the employees for duties performed, but should allow the departments and agencies to pay their employees only that amount which will guarantee their honesty. In such a scheme of things, of course, the man hardest to keep honest would get the highest pay. If I were one of the individuals concerned, I would highly resent the implication of the action of the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, let us examine that "little bit of a salary" the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] told you is being paid the 11 people to whom he has so magnanimously proposed to give the 11 new supergrades in the independent offices appropriation bill.

The Comptroller of the General Services Administration is now getting \$14,190; the other 10 employees are now being paid at least \$11,610 and possibly \$12,690, depending on length of service in the grade. I ask you, are these "little bittie salaries"? The proposed salaries are \$14,800 and \$12,900; increases ranging from \$210 to \$1,290 per year. Again I say, "What price honesty?"

Now, let us look at the comparable positions of Comptroller in other agencies under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices. There are 18 of them. Only one has a grade equal to that proposed for the General Services Administration—that is the Chief of Audit of the General Accounting Office—responsible for the expenditure of all Federal moneys, not just a few hundred million.

The Comptroller of the Veterans' Administration, with a budget some 22 times as large as that of the General Services Administration, is being paid \$13,545. Compare that with the \$14,190 now being paid the Comptroller of the General Services Administration. With this condition existing in the 18 agencies considered by the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], I ask you, how could they possibly have given thought to all of the comparable positions in the other departments and agencies of government? For instance, the top civilian Comptroller of the Army is paid \$14,190 with a budget of over \$8 billion, that of the Navy \$14,405 with a budget of some \$9 billion, and the Air Force pays theirs \$14,620 with a responsibility for over \$16 billion. Were these given consideration

in setting a salary of \$14,800 for the General Services Administration with a budget of considerably less than \$1 billion?

I find absolutely nothing in the hearings on the State and Justice appropriation bill that would justify in any way the supergrade jobs that would be created. There is no evidence that anyone was called to testify from the Civil Service Commission concerning this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, this rule ought to be defeated. Notice should be served not only upon the Appropriations Committee, and the subcommittees thereof, as well as the Rules Committee that the rules of the House were never designed to satisfy the desires of a few Members of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman realize that the subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations cut this bill to the extent of \$56,802,000, or about 9.5 percent of the amount requested by President Eisenhower through his Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am perfectly aware of that. You cut the budget askings, did you not? In other words, you cut a calculated gamble.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman that if he had read the printed testimony he would not make that statement; this was not done that way. Each item was taken separately. In that regard he might inquire of the members of the Committee on Appropriations on his side of the aisle.

Mr. GROSS. What I am saying to the gentleman is that the various departments of the Government come in and ask for far more than they expect to get; in other words, they take a calculated gamble when they come down here.

Mr. ROONEY. I have suspected that ever since the first part of 1953. Originally these agencies proceeded to cut appropriations, but this year they came back for increases in every area. If that is what is behind President Eisenhower's request in this particular instance for \$598,169,820 I am willing to take the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. GROSS. That is the way I feel about it. You have not cut the spending, you have increased the spending over last year; you are not cutting the spending.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial immediately following the last quorum call.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of the House who over the years has not at one time or another been grateful to the Rules Committee for making it easier for him to vote on a particular bill. We



all realize the wonderful service performed by the Rules Committee, but sometimes notwithstanding that very helpful service which I received on more than one occasion, it will include some waiver or provision in a resolution or put out a particular rule which causes me to wonder, therefore, whether they are trying to follow in the footsteps of the Supreme Court which appears to have assumed legislative functions by taking over jurisdiction that properly belongs to legislative committees.

If the Rules Committee in its wisdom, and it has plenty of that, is to follow a practice of bringing in a resolution waiving all points of order on appropriation bills first at the suggestion of one individual then another, permit the writing of legislation in appropriation bills, or if the Appropriations Committee is to assume the duty of writing legislation and the Rules Committee continues to permit that to go on, I, for one, if I desired to shirk my duty might be thankful and happy because I can then go fishing more afternoons and more mornings. Neither I nor any other Member will need to serve on the legislative committees. Eventually, if they follow along on that, and I refer to these two committees, we will not need any legislative committees at all. In my judgment they are now overburdened with their regular authorized duties.

Do you get the point? This is the apparent procedure proposed. We will let the Appropriations Committee write the legislation for all of us, then we will let the Rules Committee report it out waiving all points of order and the rest of us who are not on either committee will not have anything to do. Then, if that procedure is to prevail, may I ask—“Why are we here?”

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman poses a rather tough question for the Rules Committee because last year we did what the gentleman has just suggested. An appropriation bill was brought in after the Rules Committee had refused to report a rule waiving points of order. Then the Rules Committee received heaps and heaps of criticism for doing that. Now the gentleman is criticizing the Rules Committee for bringing in a rule waiving points of order. I do not see how the poor Rules Committee can survive no matter what it does.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Perhaps you will not. But the Rules Committee does a fine job, it is trying to do too much. It is trying to be too helpful, if that is possible. I have not felt capable of serving on either the Rules Committee, the Appropriations Committee or the Committee on Ways and Means, those are tough ones. I would not want to get on either, even if I were a young fellow and this was my first term. True, I am critical, but who is not? It is apparent the Rules Committee can go too far on the practice of waiving points of order. As was just suggested, ultimately, if we keep on permitting the Committee

on Appropriations to write legislation, we will not need the legislative committees. That has been said before. That is the only point I am making. If you want to do away with the legislative committees, do it by amending the Rules. No one believes that Appropriations can take over the duties of legislative committees and properly adequately perform them. The job is too big.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DELANEY. The Rules Committee as a practice does not present rules waiving points of order, but in most of these appropriation bills there are minor items included, and when the Appropriations Committee asks in good faith for a rule waiving those minor points of order the Rules Committee sometimes go along. And so in this case that is exactly what did happen.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do not misunderstand me. On various occasions I have been happy with the action that was taken, and which was helpful to me. But I was thinking of the overall situation and where we were drifting in our legislative procedure, that is all.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would not think the Appropriations Committee or any subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee would ever come before the Rules Committee except in good faith.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I realize that when the Rules Committee comes in with a proposal, the House usually accepts it. That would be all right if it occurred only occasionally, it is not good all over practice. If I was the gentleman's attorney that is what I would say.

Mr. DELANEY. And I would have a very good attorney if the gentleman were my attorney.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Rules Committee has gained the respect and support of the House to such an extent that almost everything it brings in we accept. Therefore this action today seems to be taking an unfair advantage of us.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. Is not the gentleman sometimes disturbed about the substantive content of these bills? We had a GSA bill up for consideration under the same kind of a rule, and although they admitted that my local post office is dirty and cannot be maintained adequately, they fired 5 charwomen this last year to fill 1 or 2 supergrade positions. Is it not possible that we will ultimately have all generals and nobody to clean floors by the time this is concluded?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That situation exists to a certain extent all over. I have similar trouble. They say to me, “Who are you recommending for a rural carrier or who are you recom-

mending for this \$3,000 post office job which they import somebody to take because nobody in the community wants it?” Then I make a recommendation and then I learn that somebody in the Department has control of the job, anyway, and all I have to do is to get the file and register the complaints that flood me after the appointment is made. I am not too happy about it. It would be helpful to me personally and aid me in doing my job if I had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to call attention to a provision in this bill on page 22 which is legislation on an appropriation bill. I realize this matter has been discussed to some extent, but I am here to protect, if I may, the rights and prerogatives of a legislative committee that is being circumvented by reason of a rule granted on this appropriation bill.

I agree the Rules Committee generally renders a great service. I know the members of the Appropriation Committee have worked diligently in their efforts to bring proper legislation to the floor dealing with appropriations for the agencies included in this measure. I do not say that the persons whose salaries would be increased because of this legislation may or may not be entitled to these increases. I do say that this is not the proper way to handle the situation.

There is not a thing in the hearings here with respect to these supergrades you are asking for that I know of. I would be glad to have the chairman point it out if there is. The chairman of the subcommittee is a great man, a great public servant, but it seems to me that the thing ought to be justified in the regular way.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York. I want to pay tribute to him, because he has kept these appropriations down.

Mr. ROONEY. I must say to the gentleman that these are not ideas that arose in the Committee on Appropriations. The language contained in the bill with regard to this subject was suggested by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization of the Department of Justice. The language I read awhile ago in regard to tort claims originated in the Department of State. The language in regard to the unvouchered funds for use of the Attorney General in Alaska arose in the Attorney General's Office. The committee was asked to write in a number of things, and I will give you an example of one. It was due as the result of a recent decision, a case lost by the Attorney General before the Indian Claims Commission under which we might very well have to buy the United States back from the Indians. The result of the decision says the Attorney General, may cost the taxpayers of the United States as much as \$5 billion in Indian claims. We were presented with and asked to insert certain legislative

language in the bill. The committee said, "No. This is a matter for the proper legislative committee." And we did not insert the rider. We were asked for any number of other items of legislation.

Now, in regard to the 3 inconsequential increases in grade, the gentleman well knows that if this matter of these 3 men's salaries is not now straightened out, it is not going to be done in this Congress because the gentleman's committee is not going to do anything about it. Let me conclude by saying that the gentleman appeared before the Committee on Rules only yesterday and objected to this rule, but the Rules Committee saw fit to grant it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to pay tribute to the very distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for standing here and telling us that they could not put those things in this bill. As I understand your statement, you resisted those various agencies and said, "No, we are not going to put that in the appropriation bill; it does not belong there," and I compliment you for it all the way down the line. But, here you come to this one point and you give in. You said on this one, "We will give in and put it in."

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman finds fault with us for a little matter of \$3,600 increase in salaries of these men. Is that not true?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Just one thing. Tell us this. The committee has recently reported a bill that would take care of the situation described provided, of course, the jobs justify the salaries included in this bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the able gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman, with his years of experience in this House—and parenthetically, may I say that I have always respected him and we have always been good friends—

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is true. I also respect the distinguished gentleman from New York, one of the hard working and diligent Members of this House.

Mr. ROONEY. With his years of experience, the gentleman well knows that if the House does not insert this provision, when the bill goes over to the other body, the other body will put this language in the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I understand what he means. But that does not justify our doing it. Whatever the other body would do is something else. Let us stand up on our own hind legs and take care of our own business, so far as we can. We cannot do things just to excuse the other body for what it may do, because if we did that, we would be here all day. I still think the committee was wrong by including legislation in an appropriation bill.

I do want to compliment the gentleman for the manner in which he has dealt with a number of the appropriation requests. He has seen fit to approve reductions where it would have been more popular to have increased them. I know

he has a difficult task. I think, however, there are a number of places where there should be further reductions, but the thing to which I direct attention now is that we should not include legislation on appropriation bills.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York, chairman of the subcommittee, has twice made observations in the course of colloquy under the rule on a subject on which I should like to touch upon while we are on the rule, so that it will appear in the same area of the RECORD. He has remarked about the allegedly excessive cuts in the Department of State budget in 1953. I merely want to point out for the RECORD at this time, because I am sure we will have occasion to debate it later, that 1953, if anyone has forgotten it, marked the transition from an administration that had been in power for 20 years and through 2 wars, to a brand-new administration. The brand-new administration certainly was entitled by any standard, to have a new look at the existing agencies of Government, and that new look necessarily entailed some reductions of force so a fresh start could be made.

The cut in appropriations in the fiscal year 1953 resulted in and was part of a much-needed new look in Government operations in general and operations overseas in particular. The reductions in the appropriations to the Department of State led to a streamlining in the administration and a basic look at the machinery with which we conduct our foreign affairs. This was important and useful and from this the Department has established a new, strong basis from which it is now essential to expand.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10721, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to express my grateful appreciation, as the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill, to all my colleagues on that subcommittee.

I am indeed appreciative of the great help and courtesy extended to me by the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the very distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the very distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the ranking minority Member, my good friend, and fellow New Yorker, the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], and the likewise very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER]. I very much appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended me by every one of them.

I would remiss if I did not express my thanks for his great help to the executive secretary of this committee, Mr. Jay B. Howe. Mr. Howe came to the Committee on Appropriations just a year before I first became chairman of this subcommittee. That was in the year 1949. Ever since then Mr. Howe, and I am sure I bespeak the thoughts of every member of the Committee on Appropriations, has been a trusted, valued, and competent public servant and of invaluable aid to all the members of the Committee on Appropriations, regardless of which side of the aisle happened to be in the majority at the time.

As I pointed out a while ago during the course of the debate on the rule waiving points of order against this bill, the total requests for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Judiciary, the United States Information Agency, and Refugee Relief, amounted to \$598,169,820. The committee saw fit to cut these appropriation estimates submitted by President Eisenhower to the extent of \$56,802,448. In doing so, the committee allowed the amount of \$46,794,137 above the current level; \$24,258,042 of this money is with regard to the Department of State. The Department of State came to the committee and said:

We need a substantial buildup in employees at our Foreign Service posts. We need to increase the number in the Foreign Service. We need to increase the local employees abroad at our embassies and consulates.

The committee, and I am not now speaking for my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] because he expressed on the floor here a while ago an opinion to the contrary—the committee, having in mind that there was too drastic a cut in 1953 which at that time practically decimated the Foreign Service, agreed in part with the request of the Department of State this year. I have been connected with appropriations for the Department of State for almost the past dozen years and I have always been critical of the Department of State and the Foreign Service when I thought I should have been critical. On the other hand, I am one who has always thought that we must have a strong Foreign Service and the proper and best representation we can get



abroad. With that in mind, your committee saw fit to increase the State Department to the extent of \$24,258,042.

As to the Department of Justice, the increase allowed was in the amount of \$4,893,000. Included in this bill is an appropriation pursuant to a request in the amount of \$4,265,000 for the anti-trust division. This amount is \$801,000 over the amount appropriated for this division in the current fiscal year, and will provide for the continuation on a full year basis of the additional personnel which had been approved in the second supplemental appropriation act of 1956. I might say that in allowing this full amount of the budget estimate, the committee expects that the Department will commence a vigorous program of enforcement of the anti-trust laws.

The Judiciary request for the coming fiscal year is in the amount of \$37,582,535. There was not much that could be cut with regard to this request—the amount allowed is \$2,186,900 below the amount requested, which would be an increase of \$1,479,725 above the amount allowed for the current fiscal year.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Solely to keep the record straight because I think both of us have used the wrong year—the year in which you allege excessive cuts were made was fiscal 1954.

Mr. ROONEY. No; I was speaking of calendar 1953. The gentleman knows when the cuts were made. President Eisenhower had only been in office a few months when with his great wisdom and the wisdom of his Secretary of State, he cut the Foreign Service to the bone.

Mr. COUDERT. But the fact remains nevertheless that the term fiscal 1953, I think, was used when we really mean calendar 1953 and fiscal 1954. I am not engaging in a discussion at this point with the gentleman, but I merely want the record to show that.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman and I understand each other—we know when the too-drastic cut was made.

With regard to the Federal judiciary, I regret that I again must discuss a subject which so annoyed the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] when we discussed this bill under general debate a year ago; to wit, the subject of bankruptcies. I made certain claims at that time that the number of bankruptcies were greatly increasing throughout the United States. I pointed out that those bankruptcies were bankruptcies which affected small people, and some exceptions were made to my remarks.

Well, let us see if we have the record straight at this time.

On the 8th of March last I wrote the following letter to the Chief of Bankruptcy, Administrative Office of United States Courts, Mr. Covey:

DEAR MR. COVEY: On yesterday I came across the following statement:

"According to Dun & Bradstreet figures, the rate of business failures during 1954—

42 per 10,000—was 63 percent higher than the average for the postwar years 1946-53. Reports for the first 7 months of 1955 indicate that the number of failures last year, despite all the prosperity, will not differ much from the 1954 total. The number for 7 months was 6,487. Since the average liability of these failures was \$40,000, it's a safe conclusion that most of the bankruptcies were small businesses."

I would appreciate your advice as to whether the above is correct.

With cordial regards, I am,  
Sincerely,

Under date of the 15th of March I received a letter in reply from the Chief of Bankruptcy, Mr. Covey, in which he says:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF  
THE UNITED STATES COURTS,  
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROONEY: This letter is in response to your letter of March 8, 1956, wherein you quote a statement relating to Dun & Bradstreet's figures on the rate of business failures during 1954 and 1955, and making certain comparisons with the period from 1946 to 1953. You ask whether they are correct. I believe they are substantially so, although there are a number of differences in the manner in which Dun & Bradstreet's statistics on this subject are compiled as compared with ours.

First of all, their statistics are compiled on a calendar year basis while ours are on a fiscal year basis. This should not make too much difference over a long period but it might make some for a single year.

Second, Dun & Bradstreet compile only "business failures" as I understand it, whereas we compile statistics on all bankruptcy cases including "employees" and "others not in business."

Third, they cover all types of business failures which would include common law, statutory and contract assignments for the benefit of creditors, out of court settlements, extensions and compositions, State and Federal court receiverships not under the Bankruptcy Act and bankruptcy cases including ordinary bankruptcy, arrangement and reorganization proceedings under the so-called relief chapters of the Bankruptcy Act. Our statistics deal only with cases that are administered under the Bankruptcy Act.

Fourth, their data on the amount of liabilities involved are compiled as of the date a business goes into some sort of liquidation or administration, whereas our statistics show the actual amount realized and the amount of liabilities filed and allowed in the proceeding. In other words, their statistics as to liabilities are compiled as of the date a case is filed whereas ours are compiled after a case is fully administered and closed.

Furthermore our data on ordinary bankruptcy cases as distinguished from cases under the relief chapters of the Bankruptcy Act is broken down into three categories, namely, asset cases, nominal asset cases and no-asset cases. These are defined for purposes of our statistics as follows:

1. An asset case is an ordinary bankruptcy proceeding (as distinguished from a proceeding under one of the relief chapters of the Bankruptcy Act) in which there was some distribution to some class of creditors over and above exemptions and costs of administration.

2. A nominal asset case is an ordinary bankruptcy proceeding in which there were some assets coming into the estate above exemptions but these were all consumed in payment of costs of administration.

3. A no-asset case is an ordinary bankruptcy proceeding in which there were no

assets coming into the estate above exemptions.

With regard to the statement quoted in your letter to the effect that the rate of business failures during 1954 was 63 percent higher than the average for the postwar years 1946 to 1953, our statistics indicate that this is substantially correct. I attach as exhibit A, a compilation taken from table III of our annual statistics for the years mentioned. It shows that in 1954, cases filed by merchants, manufacturers, and others in business, was 57.6 percent greater than the average number of such cases from 1946 to 1953. Also in 1955, the number of such cases filed was 60.8 percent greater than the average from 1946 to 1953. It seems to me our statistics in this regard support one another.

I also attach for your information the following exhibits with comments:

Exhibit B, number of bankruptcy cases filed by types of business in the fiscal years 1940 through 1955: From it you will observe that we show only merchants, manufacturers, and others in business.

Exhibit C, total assets realized and liabilities filed and allowed in asset cases closed in 1954 and 1955: These are the only figures we have available showing the amount of liabilities involved in asset cases. They relate to all asset cases without regard as to whether the bankrupts were or were not engaged in businesses.

Recently we have made a special study of the asset cases closed in 1954 and 1955, breaking them down into 12 groups with actual assets ranging from \$500 and under to cases with actual assets over \$50,000 each. The two lowest groups contain cases with assets of \$500 and under and with assets from \$501 to \$1,000 each. It is believed that the great majority of the cases in the two lowest groups include many bankrupts not in business (employees) as distinguished from those in business. The following compilations relate to the two lowest groups:

Asset cases closed in the years indicated

Size of estates	Number of cases	Total realization	Average realization per case
<b>1954</b>			
\$500 and under.....	1,686	\$363,297	\$215
\$501 to \$1,000.....	702	519,340	740
<b>1955</b>			
\$500 and under.....	2,293	469,158	205
\$501 to \$1,000.....	847	629,282	743

The following compilations relate to the next 9 groups (groups 3 to 11 both inclusive). It is believed that most of these would involve small business.

Asset cases closed in the years indicated

Size of estates	Number of cases	Total realization	Average realization per case
<b>1954</b>			
\$1,001 to \$2,000.....	706	\$1,031,357	\$1,461
\$2,001 to \$3,000.....	407	999,873	2,457
\$3,001 to \$4,000.....	276	956,136	3,464
\$4,001 to \$5,000.....	204	907,798	4,450
\$5,001 to \$7,000.....	231	1,371,759	5,938
\$7,001 to \$10,000.....	221	1,850,648	8,374
\$10,001 to \$15,000.....	213	2,599,223	12,203
\$15,001 to \$25,000.....	173	3,320,525	19,194
\$25,001 to \$50,000.....	131	4,477,869	34,182
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,562</b>	<b>17,215,188</b>	<b>6,719</b>
<b>1955</b>			
\$1,001 to \$2,000.....	865	1,254,667	1,450
\$2,001 to \$3,000.....	478	1,178,279	2,465
\$3,001 to \$4,000.....	325	1,129,986	3,477

*Asset cases closed in the years indicated—  
Continued*

Size of estates	Number of cases	Total realization	Average realization per case
<i>1955</i>			
\$4,001 to \$5,000.....	234	\$1,144,819	\$4,465
\$5,001 to \$7,000.....	310	1,876,450	5,901
\$7,001 to \$10,000.....	250	2,080,933	8,324
\$10,001 to \$15,000.....	229	2,781,393	12,146
\$15,001 to \$25,000.....	203	3,915,457	19,288
\$25,001 to \$50,000.....	154	5,348,584	34,731
Total.....	3,048	20,710,568	6,794

The following compilation relates to group 12 which it is believed would include cases that could be classified as large businesses:

*Asset cases closed in the years indicated*

Size of estates	Number of cases	Total realization	Average realization per case
<i>1954</i>			
\$50,000 and over.....	112	\$16,225,921	\$144,874
<i>1955</i>			
\$50,000 and over.....	124	16,671,816	134,450

Assuming groups 3 to 12, inclusive, would consist almost entirely of business failures, and assuming groups 3 to 11 represent small-business failures, the percentage of the total number of failures involved would be—

Small business, approximately 96 percent.  
Large business, approximately 4 percent.

I trust this will give you the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN L. COVEY,  
Chief of Bankruptcy.

**EXHIBIT A**

Number of bankruptcy cases filed, by occupation of the bankrupt, in the years indicated:

Fiscal year	Merchants	Manufacturers	Others in business	Total	Fiscal year	Merchants	Manufacturers	Others in business	Total
1946.....	236	201	821	1,258	1954.....	3,191	745	4,476	8,412
1947.....	631	596	1,416	2,643	1955.....	3,317	750	4,515	8,582
1948.....	1,338	808	2,546	4,692					
1949.....	1,969	853	3,664	6,486	Total.....	6,508	1,495	8,991	16,994
1950.....	2,565	803	4,568	7,936	Average.....	3,254	747	4,495	8,497
1951.....	2,360	622	4,173	7,055					
1952.....	2,319	532	3,358	6,209	Percent increase in 1954 over average from 1946 to 1953, both inclusive.....	84.66	23.34	48.95	57.61
1953.....	2,402	518	3,498	6,418	Percent increase in 1955 over average from 1946 to 1953, both inclusive.....	91.95	24.17	50.24	60.80
Total.....	13,820	4,833	24,044	42,697	Percent of average increase in 1954 and 1955 over average from 1946 to 1953, both inclusive.....	88.31	23.67	49.58	59.2
Average.....	1,728	604	3,005	5,337					

**EXHIBIT B**

*Number of bankruptcy cases filed by types of business in the fiscal years 1940 through 1955*

Fiscal year	Farmer	Employee	Professional	Others not in business	Merchants	Manufacturer	Others in business	Total	National population
1940.....	2,678	36,846	801	2,230	4,651	92	4,194	52,577	132,122,000
Percent of total.....	5.1	70.4	1.5	4.3	8.9	1.8	8.0	100.0	
1941.....	2,367	42,348	744	2,365	4,278	766	3,464	56,332	133,402,000
Percent of total.....	4.2	75.2	1.3	4.2	7.6	1.4	6.1	100.0	
1942.....	2,048	40,180	581	2,071	3,386	507	3,336	52,109	134,860,000
Percent of total.....	3.9	77.1	1.1	4.0	6.5	1.0	6.4	100.0	
1943.....	1,151	27,020	395	1,762	1,775	286	2,322	34,711	136,739,000
Percent of total.....	3.3	77.8	1.1	5.1	5.1	0.8	6.7	100.0	
1944.....	512	15,460	211	1,292	554	181	1,323	19,533	138,397,000
Percent of total.....	2.6	79.1	1.1	6.6	2.8	0.9	6.8	100.0	
1945.....	305	10,010	152	1,041	287	153	914	12,862	139,928,000
Percent of total.....	2.4	77.8	1.2	8.1	2.2	1.2	7.1	100.0	
1946.....	260	7,618	112	948	236	201	821	10,196	141,389,000
Percent of total.....	2.6	74.7	1.1	9.3	2.3	2.0	8.1	100.0	
1947.....	183	9,396	111	838	631	596	1,415	13,170	144,126,000
Percent of total.....	1.4	71.3	0.8	6.4	4.8	4.5	10.7	100.0	
1948.....	167	12,546	114	991	1,338	808	2,546	18,510	146,631,000
Percent of total.....	0.9	67.8	0.6	5.3	7.2	4.4	13.8	100.0	
1949.....	232	17,772	159	1,372	1,069	853	3,664	26,021	149,188,000
Percent of total.....	0.9	68.3	0.6	5.3	7.6	3.3	14.1	100.0	
1950.....	290	22,933	126	2,107	2,565	803	4,568	33,392	151,677,000
Percent of total.....	0.9	68.7	0.4	6.3	7.7	2.4	13.7	100.0	
1951.....	205	25,984	127	1,822	2,360	522	4,173	35,193	154,360,000
Percent of total.....	0.6	73.8	0.4	5.2	6.7	1.5	11.9	100.0	
1952.....	196	26,527	137	1,804	2,319	532	3,358	34,873	156,981,000
Percent of total.....	0.6	76.1	0.4	5.2	6.6	1.5	9.6	100.0	
1953.....	214	31,253	140	2,062	2,402	518	3,498	40,087	159,696,000
Percent of total.....	0.5	78.0	0.3	5.1	6.0	1.3	8.7	100.0	
1954.....	322	40,889	154	3,359	3,191	745	4,476	53,135	162,409,000
Percent of total.....	0.6	77.0	0.3	6.3	6.0	1.4	8.4	100.0	
1955.....	386	46,163	217	4,056	3,317	750	4,515	59,404	165,248,000
Percent of total.....	0.6	77.7	0.4	6.8	5.6	1.3	7.6	100.0	

<sup>1</sup> This figure includes 256 amended petitions and adjudications for which occupation is not shown. The percent figures for 1940 are based on 52,321 cases which excludes these 256 amended petitions.

**EXHIBIT C**

Total assets realized and liabilities filed and allowed in asset cases closed in 1954 and 1955:

	1954	1955
Number of cases.....	5,062	6,320
Total realization.....	\$34,623,745	\$38,380,830
Average realization.....	\$6,839.93	\$6,072.92
Total liabilities filed and allowed.....	\$125,370,233	\$156,601,254
Average liabilities filed and allowed.....	\$24,767	\$24,779

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the

chairman of the House Judiciary Committee [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. I am very happy that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has given us some very illuminating facts about business failures.

It seems that most of these failures pertain to small-business units. While we had this avalanche of business failures, I find that most of the Government procurement is directed to the large corporations; and I am told that 100 big corporations got 62.6 percent of the procurement totaling \$123 billion in the last 5 years.

The share of the 100 corporations, with General Motors Corp. holding the first place, was \$77,167,400,000 for the period from July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1955.

Does not the gentleman feel that if some of this procurement were directed to some of these smaller corporations we might have had a different result, one other than the horrendous factors the gentleman adverted to?

Mr. ROONEY. I most certainly agree. The gentleman well knows that every effort made by this administration since it took office has been directed to making big business bigger and has done



nothing, in my estimation, to help the small-business man. The fact that 96 percent of business failures were small business indicates that.

Now, let us refer to the Department of State.

We used to hear about homosexuals in the State Department; we used to read about it in the press. How many homosexuals do you think they found during the past year and this after this administration has been in office for 3 years? How many homosexuals do you think they found in the State Department during the past year? I refer you to page 352 of the testimony and the following colloquy:

Mr. ROONEY. How many morals cases have you had in the Department in the past year?

Mr. FLINN. We have had 42 individuals who have resigned in lieu of charges after admission. We have had 15 individuals who resigned after being confronted with the nature of the investigations, but before final processing of their cases.

Mr. ROONEY. That includes women as well as the men?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. ROONEY. These 57 cases were alleged homosexuals?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

A few years back if they had found 57 foul balls in the Department of State it would have made the front pages. But the press has had this story for a month or two now and I have not seen any mention anywhere, that they had 57 homosexuals in the Department.

Now, let us see how good the Department of Justice has done with regard to all the espionage cases and treason cases they have been talking about in the press for so long.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. Not just now. When I have finished I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman, I assure him.

Let us see what the situation is with regard to espionage cases. Four hundred and eighty-one cases were turned over to the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice under Attorney General Brownell. How many indictments do you think were obtained in these 481 cases? Two. How many convictions? Two. And were not these cases instituted back in the other administration? How many espionage cases did they close and find nothing in? Four hundred and thirteen.

Now they have almost as good a record as that in the number of sabotage cases. They claim they had 411 sabotage cases. How many pending? None. How many closed? Four hundred and eleven. How many indictments? None. How many convictions? None.

Treason cases: 273. They claim these are pending, but no convictions appear in their statistics. This will be found on page 115 of the hearings with regard to the Department of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot about Communists in Government. There has been a very peculiar situation uncovered in connection with certain funds appropriated to the President. In the supplemental appropriation bill for

the current fiscal year there was appropriated directly to President Eisenhower the sum of \$5 million, an emergency fund in connection with cultural affairs and international fairs. That fund was used to send a certain symphony orchestra to the Orient at a cost of \$267,000. This symphony orchestra was away, as I recall it, for about 5 or 6 weeks at a cost of over a quarter of a million dollars. According to the latest figures received from the Department of State there were 103 people in this orchestral contingent sent to the Orient. It now develops that of those who went to the Orient 1 out of 10 of them have been characterized by responsible law enforcement officials of the Government as either present or former members of the Communist Party. This discovery came about when certain decent American members of the aggregation reported that when the orchestra people were in Okinawa and were told that in so many minutes an American bombing plane could be over Soviet Russian territory great consternation was expressed by several members. It was said that we Americans were barbarians and always thought of war. When this same aggregation went to Hiroshima in Japan, there was a discussion amongst certain of them, in not too quiet tones, about what butchers we Americans were to have ever dropped the atom bomb on Japan.

So when they returned home some of these decent American citizens had something to say about it. Information came to this committee, which was turned over to the Office of Security of the State Department and to the FBI. The FBI made an investigation. Now, the background of these 10 people is not a background supplied by their fellow musicians. This is not background reported as hearsay from somebody on the outside. This is the background of these people as given by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and if you will bear with me a minute I will see if I can find the details as to the first of these foul balls.

Let us see about the background of the first member of this aggregation. The FBI says, not what any fellow musician said, not what I say, or what anyone else says:

Information has been reported by an informant of known reliability—

An informant of whom? Of the FBI. Who decides reliability? The FBI—

that in 1943 he was a member of the Communist Party. A similar reliable source said in 1944 that he held Communist Political Association Membership Book No. such-and-such.

The number of the book was reported by the FBI. He held that book, which had that number, on September 30, 1944.

Another informant of known reliability to the FBI said that he was a Communist in 1946, and an informant who has furnished reliable information in the past advised that this particular gentleman was a member of the International Workers Order, Lodge No. 607, in 1952, and had been a member for the past 5 years. It was further reported by the FBI that he was observed in 1952 on certain premises alleged as a secret

training school of Communist Party members.

Now let us see about the next gentleman. According to a source that furnished the FBI reliable information in the past, this gentleman was transferred from the New York City Communist Party to the Communist Party of Cleveland, Ohio, in 1942; that in 1942 he sold an automobile to Earl Browder. It was further alleged in the FBI report, reliably, that he was also registered in the Workers School in 1943. That school is now the Jefferson School of Social Science and has been cited by the Attorney General. From a source of unknown reliability it was learned that this individual had been a soloist for the record Rondo, issued by the Young Peoples Records. This organization, Young Peoples Records, was cited as a Communist front, which has been advertised by Communist bookstores and had been cited in the 1948 report from the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Now, then, let us see another one of these people. In 1940, 1941, 1942, and 1945 this individual and his wife signed nominating petitions for Communist Party candidates for the New York State elections. A list of the members of the 11th Assembly District Club of the Communist Party, Manhattan, submitted by a confidential informant of the FBI in the early part of 1944, contained the names of this man and his wife.

Now, I do not have time to read all this testimony. I am going to insert all the pages in regard thereto at this point in the RECORD:

WEDNESDAY, March 14, 1956.

#### EMERGENCY FUND FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS CULTURAL PROGRAM

Witnesses: Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration; I. W. Carpenter, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, Controller; Scott McLeod, Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs; Robinson McIlvaine, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs; Edward C. Crouch, Acting Budget Officer; Dennis A. Flinn, Director, Office of Security; Russell Riley, Director, Educational Exchange Program; Douglas N. Batson, Bureau of Public Affairs.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. McIlvaine, as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, is one of your duties to handle the program under the appropriation entitled "Funds appropriated to the President" in connection with the sending of cultural and trade-fair groups and other such people to foreign countries?

Mr. McILVAINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And last summer did you send an organization known as the Symphony of the Air to the Orient?

Mr. McILVAINE. I believe it was last summer.

Mr. BATSON. Last summer, yes.

Mr. ROONEY. What was the date?

Mr. BATSON. May and June 1955.

Mr. ROONEY. This past May and June?

Mr. BATSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And where did they go?

Mr. McILVAINE. They went to Japan, to the Philippines—is it all right if I ask Mr. Batson to supplement my answer?

Mr. ROONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BATSON. Korea, Okinawa, Thailand, Formosa, and Ceylon.

Mr. ROONEY. That is seven countries, I believe, you have given us.

Mr. BATSON. Yes, sir, but I would add Malaya.

Mr. ROONEY. How many people did you send?

Mr. BATSON. There were 101.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you have a list of them?

Mr. BATSON. I have a list of them here, yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. May I see the list?

Mr. BATSON. Certainly.

Mr. ROONEY. They were approximately 2 months in these foreign countries?

Mr. BATSON. About 6 weeks.

Mr. ROONEY. What was the cost to the taxpayers?

Mr. BATSON. \$267,005.09.

Mr. ROONEY. How many performances did they give?

Mr. BATSON. I do not have the record of that with me; I do not know exactly.

Mr. ROONEY. Will you insert that information at this point in the record?

Mr. BATSON. Yes, sir. There were 35.

Mr. ROONEY. Before you sent these people, Mr. McIlvaine, at a cost of \$267,000 to the taxpayers, did you have their names checked for security?

Mr. McILVAINE. Yes, we did.

Mr. ROONEY. Who did you have check them?

Mr. McILVAINE. We had the management and the conductors checked by the Department's Security Office.

Mr. ROONEY. I think from here on, we should use numbers in referring to them.

You have now given us 4 names which we have designated 1, 2, 3, and 4. Did you check anyone else of this group for security, beyond numbers 1 through 4, just mentioned?

Mr. McILVAINE. No, Mr. Chairman, we did not.

Mr. ROONEY. By that do you mean there was not even a check made of the name files of the FBI and the Un-American Activities Committee of the House, or anywhere else as to all other than the four mentioned?

Mr. McILVAINE. That is correct. I would like to be able to elaborate on that, if I may.

Mr. ROONEY. You may go right ahead.

Mr. McILVAINE. Well, as you know, the responsibility for operating this program is in the State Department. I want to clear up, right away, that it is a separate one from the regular exchange program.

Mr. ROONEY. But it is handled by the exchange program?

Mr. McILVAINE. It was handled by 1 branch, 4 or 5 people in 1 branch of the exchange program.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; and it worked under the director of the exchange program?

Mr. McILVAINE. That is right. But they report directly to the Interagency Committee of which I am chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. And is the United States Information Agency also in this program?

Mr. McILVAINE. They are represented on this Interagency Committee, that is right. However, we have not appeared before this committee yet, this year, for our funds, although Mr. Riley and I have testified before you previously on the regular exchange request.

Mr. ROONEY. But you did get funds from the Congress last year including the \$267,000, which was used to send this aggregation to the Orient?

Mr. McILVAINE. That is correct. Now in setting up this program, I just want to point out, that we never had any experience in this kind of operation before. Therefore, we had to make our plans as intelligently as we could on the basis of our experience. As you already know, every recipient of a United States grant for travel or study abroad under the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright programs is subject first to a name check, even though such grantees are not Government employees, nor are they entitled to have access to classified information.

In formulating our operating plans for this program we are guided by the same criteria.

The chief aim of this program is to demonstrate United States capabilities in the arts of music, drama, dance, and sports, and of course, an important byproduct of this program is the impact of the performers themselves for good will in their off hours. So naturally we determined that every effort must be made to insure that performers or groups be of the top artistic quality, and insofar as it could be determined, good representatives of the United States as well.

Mr. ROONEY. And by that do you mean dependable Americans without Communist connections?

Mr. McILVAINE. That is correct. The first of these two criteria was relatively easy to handle, that is the artistic excellence. The American National Theater and Academy of New York, a nonprofit organization, which was chartered by Congress, and which has a very fine reputation, became our technical agent for making the technical arrangements, and in the selection of people from the artistic point of view. They have enlisted the help of prominent citizens, who are expert in the fields of music, dance, and so on to see that they have the artistic qualifications, and this procedure has worked very well. I can report to you that none of the groups that have gone abroad under this program have been anything but an artistic success.

Mr. ROONEY. In this group that you sent to the Orient, known as the Symphony of the Air, were they all dependable Americans without Communist connections?

Mr. McILVAINE. I am not saying that; no, sir. However, the Symphony of the Air was a great success, from the point of view of everything that we have heard of it.

Now the second criteria, in which you are interested, and in which I am interested, that all participants be good representatives of the United States, is much less susceptible to precise determination. Clearly participants should not be persons who are Communists, or who might otherwise act against the interest of the United States. That includes various types, people who have nothing to do with communism, but who would be just plain poor representatives of the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. How about Communist sympathizers?

Mr. McILVAINE. That could include those too.

Mr. ROONEY. It should, should it not?

Mr. McILVAINE. Yes. Making a determination in the case of an individual is a very difficult thing. It is relatively easy with respect to stars and top performers, because they are frequently well known by reputation and otherwise. And, of course, as you already know, we do submit their names for a name check.

The problem becomes much more difficult when you are dealing with a large group that operates as a team. Now a symphony is a good example of this. We are dealing with their reputation as an entity; and the top ones have international reputations as orchestras, because of the conductors and managers, and so on, who have been able to produce a team that produces music. The spotlight does not often get down to the third violin player, or other routine performers. Nevertheless I think we do have to consider what kind of a person that third player of the violin is, and it is not very easy to determine. For example, we might get unverified information, concerning a hypothetical violin player, describing him as a left winger or that he belongs to a do-good organization that was infiltrated with Communists in the past.

Our security people tell me that you often will find quite a proportion of such people who have had such associations, in this field, and I believe that the people themselves admit that people in this area are somewhat naive about such political things

as the Communist conspiracy. So we had to make an operating decision in this program. And our decision was that since the President and the Congress had determined that this program was in the national interest we must try to make it work. In doing so we recognized that we must take all practical precautions to insure the proper type of performers; that in the case of large groups it was impractical to scrutinize each individual performer and that, therefore, our trust must be put in the management and the principals with whom we constantly stress the role that they and all their group play as unofficial ambassadors.

Thus, as a practical matter our assumption was if the hypothetical third violin player is a good one the overall effect of his participation in a great orchestra will far outweigh any mischief he might be able to do in the relatively few hours he is left alone on one of these tours.

Mr. ROONEY. Suppose it was said, as was written to me in a letter, that during the visit of the above-named band last year to the Orient, a good number of the members were spreading Red propaganda in the nations and islands they visited; would you then say that the third violinist's ability would outweigh the mischief he might be able to do?

Mr. McILVAINE. I would say that was bad; except for this one member that we know about, and I have no evidence that they did. However I agree that it certainly would be bad if they did. On the other hand we have had very, very heavy evidence that the overall impact of the tour was highly successful.

Mr. ROONEY. Perhaps the music was better than the third violin player?

Mr. McILVAINE. Undoubtedly it was. Most of the reports we have had in have specifically mentioned the favorable impression made by the individual performers.

I am not so naive as to believe, or to state to you that in no instance did a single American performer make a fool of himself in any of these countries, or for that matter did not talk against the interest of the United States. But I do believe that the evidence in our files show that the overall impact of this program far outweighed any possible bad effect that was given by any individual.

Now, let us go into the details of this particular orchestra. This tour was organized over a year ago, and we used the Symphony of the Air, first of all because it has a reputation of being among the top in the country, and second because at the time it was thought best to send it, a number of the city name orchestras could not go; and in accordance with the policy we had adopted, we checked the president of the orchestra and the two conductors. All of them appeared to be—

Mr. ROONEY. And the booker; don't forget him.

Mr. McILVAINE. I included him.

Mr. ROONEY. But you just said the president and the two conductors.

Mr. McILVAINE. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. But you said you checked 4 people, not just 3 of them.

Mr. McILVAINE. Four people, yes. At the very beginning, there was trouble getting the group organized. Unlike the New York Philharmonic, the Philadelphia, Boston, Indianapolis, and other symphonies, the Symphony of the Air has become a "free lance" organization, since Toscanini left and NBC ceased to sponsor it. It does not play a regular season. Many of the musicians hold other jobs on the side. Not all of them could or wanted to get away for such a long trip on such short notice. As a result quite a few substitutions were made, I am told.

One of the great Japanese newspapers put up a \$74,000 guaranty for their appearance in Tokyo, and arrangements were made with



the Defense Department for them to play for the troops in Okinawa, Korea, and Japan; and other arrangements were made for them to play throughout the Orient. The tour was not without its problems. We were really pioneering. This is the first time a symphony has ever gone to the Far East, and there were a great many problems involving such things as booking arrangements, transportation and so forth.

The report from Japan was extravagant, but typical of what we received from all the stops. It was described as the greatest cultural event that has happened in Japan since the opening of that country to the Western World.

Just last month the leading Philippine university cited the visit of the Symphony of the Air as the outstanding cultural event of the year, and presented Ambassador Ferguson with a citation to this effect for transmittal to the orchestra.

The Manila Chronicle which, by its own admission is generally critical of everything United States, had this to say:

"Once in a long time, America contrives to muster enough of her native genius to present to the rest of the world the best that she can give. When this happens, the bitterest critics of America and the American way of life restrain themselves . . . we wouldn't care if the State Department bombarded us with invasions by other symphony orchestras and with exhibitions of other American artists . . . this is the propaganda we would go out of our way to welcome. It is propaganda that will really sell the United States anywhere, be it Europe or Asia and should the United States Government adopt this propaganda as seriously and in as large a scale as it has adopted the program of military aid, all the evils with which America has been identified might be forgotten."

At one stage of the tour the orchestra was traveling in planes chartered from General Chennault's CAT airline. So pleased were the members of the orchestra with the friendly and efficient manner the pilots and crew handled the operation that they took up a collection for them. The pilots said they could not accept such a gift but would turn it over to the Formosa Symphony which was having a difficult time.

A recent letter from Taipei informs that this contribution has given the Formosa Symphony a new lease on life and that they look on the Symphony of the Air as their cultural godparents.

The comments from the other places were in the same vein. Everywhere they went tribute was paid to the excellence of the performance and the impressions of the performers as individuals.

On the basis of their record we considered the Symphony of the Air for another tour next year, but something happened.

Mr. ROONEY. Did you not consider them for a tour this year?

Mr. McILVAINE. It was this calendar year; yes.

Mr. ROONEY. In the time already past?

Mr. McILVAINE. No; the consideration was for a tour next fall.

Mr. ROONEY. For 1956?

Mr. McILVAINE. 1956; yes, sir. Now something happened to this orchestra on its return. The management that we have mentioned moved out, and there were elections and new management came in. Soon thereafter we began to hear reports of dissension, and when we made our routine check on the new management it was clear that we did not have the kind of leadership that could be counted on to be good representatives abroad.

Mr. ROONEY. When did you make that routine check with respect to management?

Mr. McILVAINE. I am not sure of the date.

Mr. BATSON. In January.

Mr. ROONEY. What did you do in making the check; who made the check?

Mr. McILVAINE. We sent a memorandum over to the security officer and asked him for a check on the names.

Mr. ROONEY. It is my understanding that the security officer knew nothing about this until sometime about the 18th of January, when we took it up with him. Do you know anything about that?

Mr. McILVAINE. No; I do not. Maybe Mr. Flinn can tell you.

Mr. ROONEY. Wait a minute. Is that correct, Mr. Flinn, that you were handed certain information by me, on or about the 18th of January?

Mr. FLINN. That is right; the other requests were in process, when I received this information from you.

Mr. ROONEY. What request?

Mr. FLINN. The request from IES to check the new management; so that this thing happened simultaneously.

Mr. ROONEY. This is very strange. I have not heard that until this day, although we have discussed this situation to quite some extent. Do you have a copy of this request?

Mr. FLINN. I can get it.

Mr. McILVAINE. I think possibly Mr. Flinn personally did not know I had called for that.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you have a copy of that request here? We should like to see it.

Mr. McILVAINE. Very well.

Mr. ROONEY. Will you file it, please.

Mr. BATSON. We may have it in the files. (The following information was subsequently supplied:)

"During first week of January 1956, 7 name checks were initiated incident to consideration of the orchestra for 1956 tour, including Nos. 22, 7, 16, 31, 6, and 2 unnumbered individuals."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Flinn, did he check all members of that orchestra?

Mr. FLINN. No, sir; only the names listed by request for him.

Mr. McILVAINE. The management, again, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Have you since checked all others in addition to the 30 names that the informant gave the FBI?

Mr. FLINN. That was handled by the FBI at that time.

Mr. ROONEY. There were 2 separate lists investigated; 2 separate investigations?

Mr. FLINN. No, sir. As a part of this investigation I submitted the entire list with a request that the FBI make a thorough check; investigate the allegations made against this orchestra as a whole, in addition to the names mentioned by the original informant.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you have a copy of that with you?

Mr. FLINN. A copy—

Mr. ROONEY. A copy of the report with regard to the entire aggregation.

Mr. FLINN. I have the report, yes; it came back, a copy covering the entire group.

Mr. ROONEY. And you have that here with you?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Go ahead, Mr. McILVAINE.

Mr. McILVAINE. Accordingly when we got this information which we have been discussing, which came almost simultaneously to your committee, we canceled the project. In doing so we had to be careful so as not to jeopardize the investment we already had in the Orient both in dollars and good will. Accordingly, we merely informed them that we were canceling the project and gave no reasons why we were doing so.

Mr. ROONEY. Who was the conductor of the orchestra at that time?

Mr. McILVAINE. There was no conductor as yet.

Mr. FLINN. That is correct.

Mr. McILVAINE. This orchestra does not have a regular conductor; they get people to be guest conductors. I feel that—

Mr. ROONEY. Is No. 5 one of the conductors of this orchestra?

Mr. McILVAINE. He has been a guest at various times. At the present time he would not be on any of our programs.

Mr. ROONEY. Has he been associated with the orchestra within the past year?

Mr. McILVAINE. I believe he has, when it plays in the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well, Mr. McILVAINE, you may proceed.

Mr. McILVAINE. I felt very strongly that in canceling this project we had 2 problems; 1 is the impact of a hassle over this question abroad, after the orchestra was so successful. And for this reason, because I think all here are trying to do what is best for the country, I would hope that this particular phase of the discussion in this session would not be made public. I am raising this point—

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. McILVAINE, do you not think the public is entitled to know the type of people that make up an orchestra that goes abroad at a cost to the taxpayers of this country of a quarter million dollars?

Mr. McILVAINE. I do, sir, if we know exactly what we are saying about them. Off the record I would prefer—

Mr. ROONEY. No; stay on the record, please.

Mr. McILVAINE. I would agree with you, and I think it would be better if that phase of this could be handled separately from this program so that there would be no possibility of jeopardizing the undeniably good job they did and the good effect the orchestra had on the last trip.

Mr. ROONEY. Well don't associate me with that, though—because that is not my information at all. That does not reflect my thought on the subject at all.

Mr. McILVAINE. We have approached this whole program, as I hope you appreciate, in addition to opposing communism, to put on a program that is as constructive as possible in this particular stage of the world situation.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask you a question, Mr. McILVAINE?

Mr. McILVAINE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Is not the very purpose of the program to combat and to contain communism abroad?

Mr. McILVAINE. The purpose of the program is to show the cultural development in the United States, and in that context to put the lie to Communist propaganda that all the interest we have in the United States is to—

Mr. ROONEY. Are we to understand that it is not the underlying reason for a program such as this, where some \$5 million was appropriated to President Eisenhower for use in connection therewith, to combat and contain communism?

Mr. McILVAINE. It is to combat Communist propaganda, which is in itself to combat communism.

Mr. ROONEY. It was nice of you to stretch it that far. Go ahead.

Mr. McILVAINE. I believe very strongly that this kind of a program is in the national interest; in fact we can no longer afford not to take steps to show that we have in this country something besides a strong defense and some of the best gadgets for comfortable living. I wish I could be able to tell that we have been able to find a workable system whereby we could guarantee to you and the American people that no one could go abroad under this program about whom there is not some taint. If we tried to make such a guaranty we would be dishonest, because I do not believe we could deliver. We can and do assure you that we regard this matter with the utmost seriousness; we have since the very inception of the program. Yet we have always known that lacking the kind of criteria that exists for Government employment and access to classified information, risks are involved.

Now I have never been one to contend that any particular administrative program is perfect or not susceptible to change. As I have already indicated we have kept this one under constant scrutiny. As a result of this study I believe we have taken steps to lessen the kind of risks that are involved in such a program.

Specifically we have taken steps to get the same check on rank and file performers that we have been getting on the leaders. We are continuing to stress the importance of this phase of the program to impresarios and union leaders.

Despite these efforts I am sure that our headaches will continue. However, nothing worth while is easy to accomplish. We believe in this program and believe with you that the interest of our country should be foremost in every phase of its operation. That is our sole aim in this operation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. McIlvaine, you are familiar with the fact, are you not, that I turned certain information over to the security officer of the State Department on or about the 18th of January; are you familiar with that fact?

Mr. McILVAINE. No; I am familiar with the fact that you did; I do not recall the date.

Mr. ROONEY. Are you familiar with the fact that thereafter the FBI made certain investigations?

Mr. McILVAINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Now, have you seen the results of that investigation?

Mr. McILVAINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. If you had had that investigation before you spent \$267,000 of the taxpayers' money in sending this aggregation to the Orient, would you have permitted them to go?

Mr. McILVAINE. I would have first seen what possibilities there were to eliminate certain members of the orchestra and if that had not been possible I think probably I would not have let them go.

Mr. ROONEY. How many members of the orchestra?

Mr. McILVAINE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I just cannot say. This is in this great gray area I referred to in my earlier testimony, as to where you draw the line in these things; where people are a part of the overall effect and not involved in security of the United States, as such. I am not an expert on that kind of thing, but I do know how difficult it is to draw the line.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you not think that before they went you should have had their names checked with the FBI and the Un-American Activities Committee and other agencies, all the names of the persons in this program on whom you spent this \$267,000?

Mr. McILVAINE. As I have already told you, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ROONEY. Please let me have, once in a while, a categorical answer.

Mr. McILVAINE. What was your question? Mr. ROONEY. The question was: Do you not think that before you sent any of them on whom a part of this \$267,000 of the taxpayers' money was spent that you should have first checked at least their names with the FBI and the Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. McILVAINE. We did not consider this practical up until now.

Mr. ROONEY. You have not answered my question, unless I misunderstand your answer. By that answer you mean you do not think you should have had the names checked before you sent them out at a cost of \$267,000?

Mr. McILVAINE. Mr. Chairman, that was the procedure under which we were operating.

Mr. ROONEY. I am not asking what procedure you were following; I am asking you a very simple question. Before you spent \$267,000 of the taxpayers' money and sent this group abroad last summer, do you not

think that you should at least have had their names checked with the FBI and the House Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. McILVAINE. Well, yes.

Mr. ROONEY. To whom was this money appropriated that we are talking about here, this \$267,000; to whom was it appropriated?

Mr. McILVAINE. That comes out of the President's emergency fund for participation in international affairs.

Mr. ROONEY. And is there coordination of this program between the USIA, the Department of State, and the exchange program with the White House?

Mr. McILVAINE. There is no direct contact with the White House. The Information Agency is assigned as the coordinator of the two arms of the program, one the trade fairs, and the other the cultural presentation program.

Mr. ROONEY. This was not money that was appropriated directly to the Department of State, was it?

Mr. McILVAINE. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Was it money that was appropriated to the United States Information Agency?

Mr. McILVAINE. It is my understanding—and I do not know exactly, but it is my understanding—

Mr. BAWSON. The answer is "No."

Mr. ROONEY. These were moneys appropriated to the President for his emergency fund; is that right?

Mr. McILVAINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Now, do you have the report with regard to the people who were on this trip? Do you have such a report? Who has it?

Mr. McILVAINE. I would not have that.

Mr. FLINN. The report of the investigation?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. FLINN. I have that.

Mr. ROONEY. On or about the 18th of January 1956, were you in touch with me, Mr. Flinn?

Mr. FLINN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. At that time I told you that I had the name of a certain person in the city of New York which had been sent to me by a retired detective of the police department of that city?

Mr. FLINN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. And did I give you a copy of that letter?

Mr. FLINN. You gave me a copy of the portion of the letter without the signature of your correspondent.

Mr. ROONEY. But including the name and address and telephone number of the informant?

Mr. FLINN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. And what did you then do?

Mr. FLINN. I referred this—since the information contained in the letter appeared to come within the internal security jurisdiction of the FBI, I referred it to the FBI.

Mr. ROONEY. What did you then find?

Mr. FLINN. The FBI made the investigation and submitted the results to the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. And what did it report?

Mr. FLINN. They reported the interview with the original informant named in the letter to you, sir, and the results of the names-check of those persons he named including others in this orchestra who had gone on this Far East tour.

Mr. ROONEY. Let us stay with the original informant—the first person they interviewed.

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. We will call him No. 6.

Mr. FLINN. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. What did No. 6 say?

Mr. FLINN. He identified himself as associated with this orchestra in the past, and stated that since the last election of officers of the orchestra, when the leftist group took control, he has not played with the orchestra.

Mr. ROONEY. Excuse me a moment.

Mr. FLINN. Certainly.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well, proceed. We were inquiring with reference to what No. 6 said.

Mr. FLINN. He attributed his lack of further employment with the orchestra to an incident that took place in 1955 when the arrangements were made for the trip to the Orient, which the orchestra made. He had made a comment to one of the members of the orchestra that some of the fellows were going to have difficulty—

Mr. ROONEY. He made the comment to No. 7; and who was No. 7?

Mr. FLINN. I do not have that—he is a member of the symphony.

Mr. ROONEY. The manager of the orchestra?

Mr. FLINN. Apparently that has certain information better than I have on this paper.

Mr. ROONEY. Are you looking at the report of February 15?

Mr. FLINN. No, I am looking at the raw material which I received, and I have identified the man there, but I did not identify him here, you see.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well.

Mr. FLINN. He said that he had made this comment to No. 7, that some of the fellows were going to have difficulty in making the tour because they would have difficulty in getting a passport.

Mr. ROONEY. Did he say, because of their background?

Mr. FLINN. Because of their background. No. 7 replied that if he continued to talk in this manner that he would never play with the orchestra again.

Since that statement No. 6 said that he was constantly watched by the "leftist," while in the Far East. He also described an incident which occurred while on the tour, where he was given a "trial," when he was charged by other members of the orchestra with using vile language in the presence of an Army officer's wife. This trial resulted in proof that No. 6 did not make these comments in front of—in the presence of ladies, and it seems as though—and I am interpolating now, that in some of the comments made by No. 6, there is a showing of spite. However, he did name approximately 30 people associated with the orchestra, which he identified as the "leftist" group. He referred to certain other incidents which occurred in the Far East.

Mr. ROONEY. Before you get away from that, and concerning the vile language: What else did he say, if anything, with regard to that officer and his wife?

Mr. FLINN. He said that he was later invited by the officer and his wife to visit their home which apparently disproved the false charges made by the other member of the orchestra.

Mr. ROONEY. What objection is there to just reading this matter, to save time?

Mr. FLINN. I would prefer that this did not go in verbatim.

Mr. ROONEY. Was No. 6 asked to elaborate on his allegation that some of the Symphony of the Air members spread "Red" propaganda while on the tour of the Orient?

Mr. FLINN. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. What did he say?

Mr. FLINN. He stated that No.—

Mr. ROONEY. That is No. 8?

Mr. FLINN. I will leave out the designation, because that identifies him. That No. 8 had highly praised and agreed with the book which contained—

Mr. ROONEY. Was there a change in the officials so that it would not be possible to now tell exactly who was the chairman of the board?

Mr. FLINN. This was not the name of the chairman of the board.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well, proceed. What did he say?

Mr. FLINN. He said this, that No. 8 highly praised and agreed with a book which condemned the atom bombing of Hiroshima.



Another example of propaganda given by the informant was that fact that number—

Mr. ROONEY. That is what number?

Mr. FLINN. No. 9, associated with the orchestra, constantly praised Russian music and stated that its culture was superior to ours. He added that while at Army installations in the Far East, the musicians with the orchestra took photographs. He admitted that he could not be specific as to the allegations of the Red propaganda, nor cite specific instances as to the spread of that propaganda. He did furnish, however, a list of 30 individuals suspected by him of being "leftists."

This informant was also not quite articulate when asked to define the term "leftist."

Mr. ROONEY. Did he not say that he believed there were certain people who were un-American?

Mr. FLINN. Un-American; yes.

Mr. ROONEY. What, if anything, did No. 6 say about No. 4?

Mr. FLINN. He stated that he suspected No. 4 of black-market activities while on this trip to Thailand, because the musicians were paid in local currency rather than in American dollars.

Mr. ROONEY. What else, if anything, did he point out?

Mr. FLINN. He pointed out also that No. 18, No. 32, and No. 11, although not members of the orchestra, were planning to be included in the 1956 tour. He described these individuals as violent Communists, and stated that the musicians union had identified them as such. He could not furnish first-hand information in so describing these individuals.

Mr. ROONEY. Was there a source interviewed who requested that his name be kept confidential?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Was he interviewed?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Was he in a position, or did he say he was in a position to furnish information concerning the activities of the Symphony of the Air?

Mr. FLINN. He said he was in a position.

Mr. ROONEY. What, if anything, did he say?

Mr. FLINN. He described the background of the orchestra; in fact, he was formerly associated with the National Broadcasting Co.—formerly known as the National Broadcasting Co. orchestra, and conducted by Arturo Toscanini.

Mr. ROONEY. How long had he been with that orchestra; did he say?

Mr. FLINN. He said that he had been with the orchestra for a good many years, and that he made this tour of the Far East under the auspices of the State Department, from April to July in 1955. He added that he knew no basis for the assertion that the orchestra was out to spread Red propaganda on the tour. He advised that he and No. 1 would not have permitted such use of the orchestra.

Do you want me to go into this internal struggle within the orchestra?

Mr. ROONEY. I think the safest and fairest thing is to have the whole thing right on the record. Does anybody disagree?

Mr. PRESTON. If we are going into it we had better do it thoroughly.

Mr. ROONEY. Did he name certain people, that is, this informant?

Mr. FLINN. Yes; he named certain people in the orchestra, and he described a rift that had existed internally in the orchestra for some time in the past; an internal rift.

Mr. ROONEY. What, if anything, did he say about No. 6?

Mr. FLINN. He stated that, in his opinion, No. 6 talked too much, and added that No. 6 had been warned in the past to wait until he had the facts to support him before making a statement. He continued—that is, No. 6—to accuse some members of the orchestra of being Communists, and thereupon

became the subject of controversy within the orchestra itself.

Mr. ROONEY. Did he say anything with reference to a scheduled tour of the orchestra?

Mr. FLINN. He added that the orchestra was scheduled for a tour—there was consideration in the State Department of a tour of Europe and the Near East during 1956.

Mr. ROONEY. In February 1956—did he say?

Mr. FLINN. In February 1956.

Mr. McILVAINE. Mr. Chairman, that looks like what I stated was not accurate.

Mr. ROONEY. No; I am not trying to show that you were inaccurate; I am merely trying to show what this informant said at this point. What, if anything, was said to him—

Mr. FLINN. About tours?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. FLINN. He said the schedule had been deferred until October of 1956. And that it might be further postponed.

Mr. ROONEY. Did the FBI interview a party whom we shall call No. 36?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What did No. 36 say?

Mr. FLINN. He described his position in the orchestra during the tour made of the Far East.

Mr. ROONEY. When was he interviewed?

Mr. FLINN. He was interviewed in January 1956.

Mr. ROONEY. Did he say he had no special information?

Mr. FLINN. He said that he had on special information regarding the spread of Red propaganda, but he felt and had heard that several members of the orchestra were Communists, and he had been told by one member of the orchestra that No. 7, No. 31—

Mr. ROONEY. No. 31.

Mr. FLINN. Yes; No. 21 and No. 24 were card-carrying members of the Communist Party; and that No. 37, not a member of the orchestra, but who is himself an orchestra conductor might be communistically inclined. He continued that although he had no factual data, he felt that a certain local union is controlled by the Communist faction. He stated the feeling that because of his own rightist tendencies that he had been held back in his career in the music profession; he felt—he believed that people who contract for orchestras might be communistically inclined. That is all under that one.

Mr. ROONEY. Was there a further source interviewed?

Mr. FLINN. Yes; there was one interviewed with the request that his name be kept confidential.

Mr. ROONEY. What was the date of his interview?

Mr. FLINN. January 1956.

Mr. ROONEY. Did he say he toured the Far East with the Symphony of the Air last year?

Mr. FLINN. That does not show in my report—may I look at that list? Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And what else, if anything, did he say with regard to that trip?

Mr. FLINN. He described the background of the orchestra. He said that the orchestra was attempting to obtain grants from the United States Government and Ford Foundation. He advised that during the fall of 1955 that the left-wing faction of the orchestra gained control of the organization; and at that time the anti-Communist faction had for all practical purposes been ostracized. He claimed that the anti-Communist group in the orchestra consisted of 10 to 15 musicians; that he received very few engagements—

Mr. ROONEY. Did he name anybody?

Mr. FLINN. He named the following persons as Communists, although he was unable to offer proof other than stating that he and the other members of the orchestra were loyal Americans and have the feeling that these are Communists: No. 13, No. 16, No. 21, No. 24.

Mr. ROONEY. No. 8?

Mr. FLINN. 7, 29, 31, and 8.

Mr. ROONEY. Well we had better call him No. 38.

What if anything did he say about the trip to the Far East?

Mr. FLINN. He said that during the trip that the left-wing group constantly praised the Soviet Union as to cultural and economic achievements. While in Seoul, Korea, this group was unanimous in describing the devastation as having been caused by American imperialists; and also they referred to Americans as butchers when they viewed the ruins of Hiroshima.

Mr. ROONEY. When you say "they," do you mean those whom he referred to as the left-wing group?

Mr. FLINN. As the left-wing group; yes.

Mr. ROONEY. Very good; and he added what, if anything?

Mr. FLINN. He added that No. 7 became irritated in Japan when members of the orchestra were informed that within 27 minutes the United States could bomb the Soviet Union.

Mr. ROONEY. Where did he say they then were?

Mr. FLINN. At Sandai, Japan. He described No. 7 as a vicious Communist who loathed anything American. He added that he had heard from unrecalled sources that No. 7 was able to arrange his last tour of the Far East through contact in the State Department. He was unable, however, to be specific when he classified a person as a Communist, and defined "leftist" as a "cover for one who is a pro-Communist." In closing this person stated that he hated to see the United States foot the bill for a bunch of pinks.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the background of No. 7? Incidentally before you give me that, he was the manager of this tour; was he not?

Mr. FLINN. I can't answer that.

Mr. ROONEY. Is that right; was No. 7 the manager of the tour?

Mr. McILVAINE. Who was that?

Mr. ROONEY. Suppose you take a look at the list.

Mr. BATSON. According to that list at the time the trip was made—we did not know who was; it may be that he was designated as that; he did not have that title when he worked with the organization.

Mr. ROONEY. You did not check him at all?

Mr. BATSON. No, we did not. He did not have that title at the time. We would have checked him; yes, if he had we did not know until after they started on the trip.

Mr. ROONEY. According to this list, he is designated as the tour manager?

Mr. BATSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. What does the report say?

Mr. FLINN. No. 7, according to the information which became available from various sources, was registered with the American Labor Party, 1937 and 1938; 1940-44; and 1946, 1948-52.

In addition there is reference to the fact that he was a sponsor of the Artists Front To Win the War, cited by the House committee as a Communist organization, which grew out of a mass meeting at Carnegie Hall in 1942.

Mr. ROONEY. No. 7.

Mr. FLINN. No. 7 was listed as the sponsor of this meeting. Considerable information was obtained relating to his wife. Do you want me to give that?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. FLINN. There is information to the effect that she was a signer of the 1943 Communist Party nomination petition and information of unknown reliability alleges that she contributed to the Jefferson School of Social Science in 1944. As you know, this school has been cited by the Attorney General. She was associated with the National Council of Artists, Scientists, and Professors, which was cited as a Communist-front organization by the HCUA, and has been in

contact with several persons identified as members of the Communist Party. She also registered a preference for the American Labor Party in the years 1937, 1946, 1950, and 1951.

Mr. ROONEY. Is there something in there about his wife being questioned by the FBI, or about the signing of a Communist nominating petition?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, she was; sources of known reliability; in 1943 she signed a Communist Party nominating petition. I read that at the end.

Mr. ROONEY. Was there a request of her at one time for an interview by the FBI?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What happened to that?

Mr. FLINN. But that was not in connection with this inquiry?

Mr. ROONEY. That was at some other time?

Mr. FLINN. At some other time and on circumstances unknown to me.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well. Now with regard to No. 8, what has been reported with regard to his background?

Mr. FLINN. Information has been reported to the effect, by an informant of known reliability in 1943, that he was a member of the Communist Party. A similar source in 1944 said that he—

Mr. ROONEY. Reliable source?

Mr. FLINN. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. Go ahead.

Mr. FLINN. Said that he held a Communist Political Association membership book, number (number deleted).

Mr. ROONEY. On what date?

Mr. FLINN. On September 30, 1944. Another informant of known reliability said that he was a Communist in 1946; and an informant who has furnished reliable information in the past advised that No. 8 was a member of the International Workers Order, Lodge No. 607, in 1952, and had been a member for the past 5 years.

Mr. ROONEY. What about that next statement?

Mr. FLINN. I think that ought to be left out; that is a matter that is under continuous investigation. It was reported that he was observed in 1952, on certain premises, alleged as a secret training school of Communist Party members.

Mr. ROONEY. All right; you spoke of an informant; you are speaking of the FBI informant are you?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Now with regard to No. 13, do you have his background?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is it?

Mr. FLINN. There is information from a source that has furnished reliable information in the past that No. 13 was transferred from the New York City Communist Party to the Communist Party of Cleveland, Ohio, in 1942.

Mr. ROONEY. What does the result of your investigation show with regard to an automobile?

Mr. FLINN. With reference to what number?

Mr. ROONEY. With reference to No. 13.

Mr. FLINN. It shows that he sold an automobile in 1942 to Earl Browder.

Mr. ROONEY. Now what further, if anything, was disclosed with regard to No. 13?

Mr. FLINN. It is further alleged by—reliably—that he was also registered in the "workers school" in 1943. That school is now the Jefferson School of Social Science and has been cited by the Attorney General.

Mr. ROONEY. Where did the information with regard to No. 13 having been registered for the fall term of the workers school in 1943 come from?

Mr. FLINN. It was from reliable sources—I am sorry, I would like to correct that. It is from a source considered reliable in the past.

Mr. ROONEY. What was disclosed as to his background?

Mr. FLINN. From a source of unknown reliability it was learned that this individual had been a soloist for the record Rondo, issued by the Young Peoples Records. This organization, Young Peoples Records, was cited as a Communist front, which has been advertised by Communist bookstores, and had been cited in the 1948 report from the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. ROONEY. What further were you advised?

Mr. FLINN. In 1945, a source which furnished reliable information in the past indicated that No. 13 was in contact—

Mr. ROONEY. With whom?

Mr. FLINN. With No. 39, and discussed No. 40, a Soviet espionage agent, with No. 39. This source added that No. 13 was a good friend of No. 39; was acquainted with No. 40. No. 40 and No. 39 were associated in the Keystone Recording—

Mr. ROONEY. The Keynote.

Mr. FLINN. The Keynote Recording, Inc., which organization was cited by HCUA as a Communist Party front. That is the sum total on that number.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you have the background of a person who is shown on this list as No. 14?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is his background?

Mr. FLINN. Investigation reflected No. 14 indicated as party preference the American Labor Party for the years 1941, 1948, 1949, and that his wife had shown the same preference in 1949. No. 14's brother was reportedly employed by the Artkino Pictures, Inc., New York City, in 1945, and in charge of preparation for the American release of pictures imported from the Soviet Union. This brother was reported in 1951 to have been employed by a motion-picture servicing firm, outside of Artkino Pictures, but continued to use facilities of this organization. Artkino—

Mr. ROONEY. No. 14 registered in 1952 as agent of a foreign principal in Moscow?

Mr. FLINN. No, sir; but Artkino Pictures, Inc.

Mr. ROONEY. The firm was registered as a foreign agent?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir; had registered with the Department of Justice in 1952 as agent of a foreign principal, an organization in Moscow, Russia.

Mr. ROONEY. Known as Soyusintorgkino?

Mr. FLINN. The registration statement sets forth that the purpose of this organization, Artkino Pictures, was to import motion-picture films from the Soviet Union, and was the sole distributor of such films in the Western Hemisphere. This organization also exported American films to the U. S. S. R. and distributed Soviet film matters to the United States Government agencies.

Mr. ROONEY. Had No. 14 previously been investigated?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. In 1952 in connection with application for employment with the Government which was subsequently turned down?

Mr. FLINN. I do not know whether it was turned down.

Mr. ROONEY. I believe that was in August of 1952.

Mr. FLINN. Yes; he was investigated but he did not meet the employment standards of the Department.

Mr. ROONEY. Did No. 21 go on the trip to the Orient last summer?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is his background?

Mr. FLINN. In 1940, 1941, and 1942, and 1945, this individual and his wife signed nominating petitions for Communist Party candidates for the New York State election. A list of the members of the 11th Assembly District Club of the Communist Party, Manhattan, submitted by a confidential informant

in the early part of 1944, contained the names of No. 21 and his wife.

Mr. ROONEY. They were listed—

Mr. FLINN. They were registered for the American Labor Party from 1944 through 1951; and his wife for the same party in 1952, while No. 21 registered for one of the major political parties.

Mr. ROONEY. Was No. 21 previously investigated before that year, and if so in what years?

Mr. FLINN. He was previously investigated in 1945 and 1953. One other matter shows that No. 21 and his wife reportedly also entered the International Workers Order in 1943.

Mr. ROONEY. Did No. 31 go on this trip to the Orient?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is his background?

Mr. FLINN. The only information of a derogatory nature on this individual is from an informant who has furnished reliable information in the past, which advises that No. 31 was a member of the International Workers Order in December 1947. This organization has been designated by the Attorney General, as you know.

Mr. ROONEY. Did No. 4 go on this tour to the Orient?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is his background?

Mr. FLINN. During 1955 information was received concerning proposed tour of—

Mr. ROONEY. Of a certain well-known performer?

Mr. FLINN. Of a certain well-known performer, to the Near and Far East during the spring of that year. The concert agent for this individual was apparently No. 4, Mr. Louis S. Budenz, former party functionary reportedly described as—

Mr. ROONEY. Reportedly described this well-known entertainer?

Mr. FLINN. Described this well-known entertainer as a Communist entertainer, by reputation, as well as a former member of the Communist Party. House Committee on Un-American Activities records also reflect No. 4 sent greetings to the U. S. S. R. on the 10th anniversary of the Russian revolution, according to the Daily Worker of November 27, 1927.

Mr. ROONEY. What does the record indicate with regard to No. 5?

Mr. FLINN. He did not go on this tour.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, but we should have his background in view of the fact that he has been the conductor of this orchestra at various times.

Mr. FLINN. It is very lengthy.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well, please proceed.

Mr. FLINN. There is considerable information available on No. 5. He has been described by the former research director for the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a "confirmed fellow traveler, whose sympathies are definitely pro-Soviet." It is further stated that some of the organizations which No. 5 has sponsored and lent his name to are considered definitely dangerous because of their close control by the Communist element.

In 1948 two individuals associated with the World Telegram described No. 5 as a habitual joiner of fellow traveler Communist-front organizations, most of which they considered fairly dangerous organizations and very closely connected with the Communist Party. These individuals did not know No. 5 as an actual member of the party but stated his political leanings are "away over for the Soviet Government." An informant of known reliability stated that in 1945 when the Committee To Aid Ben Davis was being considered, both Ben Davis and Jack Stachel described No. 5 as an adherent to the Communist Party.

Alexander Trachtenberg and V. J. Jerome reportedly also described No. 5 as a Communist. According to Stachel, No. 5 allegedly agreed to submit to Communist discipline.



Davis, Trachtenberg, and Stachel were high officials of the Communist Party and were tried and convicted under the Smith Act.

It will be noted that the informant in this regard stated he had no direct personal knowledge of the facts set forth immediately above.

In 1948 a confidential source of known reliability advised that No. 5 was one of the individuals listed to be developed as a contact by a foreign government.

Mr. ROONEY. Of the Soviet bloc?

Mr. FLINN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Instead of government, let's make it the consulate general of a Soviet satellite country.

Mr. FLINN. Another confidential source of known reliability advised that in 1948 in a certain labor union No. 5 was regarded as one of a group who were leftwing in their thinking and possibly sympathetic to the Communist line. Various records reflect that No. 5 was an official of the following organizations in the late 1940's, as indicated—and may I supply the list?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. FLINN. I will supply also those he sponsored, and the petitions, letters, and statements which he signed, and the organizations for which he was the speaker. The above record is not all inclusive.

Mr. ROONEY. You will please furnish the report with regard to his affiliations.

Mr. FLINN. Yes; I will file this statement; there are 2 pages of it.

(The material above referred to follows:)

"Various records reflect that No. 5 was an official of the following organizations in the late 1940's, as indicated:

"Vice Chairman, the American-Soviet Music Society (an affiliate of the National Council of American Soviet Friendship)."

"Member, board of directors, Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions."

"Council member of Council on African Affairs."

"Member, board of sponsors, People's Songs, Inc."

"Member, board of directors, American Council for a Democratic Greece."

"Member, executive board, New York committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare."

"Board of directors, New York State chapter of the Progressive Citizens of America."

"These records reflect that No. 5 was a sponsor of the following:

"National sponsor, Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee for the years 1946, 1948, 1949, and 1951."

"National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions," Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, March 25-27, 1949.

"Young Progressive Citizens of America (youth lobby to Washington), June 15-16, 1947."

"Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy," 1946 through 1948.

"Civil Rights Congress," national conference, Chicago, November 21-23, 1947.

"Sponsor of and received award at Salute to Young America dinner on first anniversary of American Youth for Democracy, October 10, 1944."

"Hans Eisler concert, February 28, 1948."

"World Youth Conference," July 1947.

"The records further reflect the following petitions, letters, and statements which had been signed by No. 5:

"Open letter to Congress by the Civil Rights Congress for defeat of the Mundt bill, 1948."

"Letter from Civil Rights Congress scoring Subversive Control Act of 1948."

"Statement attacking American policy in Germany, January 1948."

"Petition to Attorney General Clark in behalf of Hans Eisler, December 1947."

"Protest against deportation of Hans Eisler, December 1947."

"Statement by American Committee for Spanish Freedom, artists' and scientists' division, asking for severance of diplomatic relations with Franco Spain, February 1945."

"In addition, No. 5 was engaged as a speaker for the following organizations:

"Committee for the First Amendment," on a radio broadcast attacking the Committee on Un-American Activities, November 1947."

"Committee for the First Amendment" on the Hollywood Flights Back broadcast, November 2, 1947."

"American Youth for Democracy," July 1947."

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to No. 7, did he go on this trip to the Orient?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is his background?

Mr. FLINN. The background of No. 7 reflects that he—

Mr. ROONEY. I believe we already have that. What is the background of No. 24?

Mr. FLINN. As you are aware, No. 24 did not go on the tour.

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FLINN. We do, however, possess the following information concerning him. A source, whose identity is unknown, advised in 1944 that a mass meeting was held in Jamaica, Long Island, to celebrate the Queens County Communist Party recruiting drive. Earl Browder was the principal speaker and it states that among the ace recruiters were included a party bearing the same name as the last named individual—No. 24. They may be identical; there is no proof that they are identical.

In 1944, a source which has furnished reliable information in the past, advised that No. 24 formerly—

Mr. ROONEY. No. 24 and his wife?

Mr. FLINN. And his wife, yes, formerly belonged to the North Jamaica Communist Political Association group, but were to form with others the nucleus of a new unit. This individual may be identical with No. 24.

Another source furnishing reliable information in the past advised that No. 24 and his wife attended Queens County Communist Political Association council meeting held at county committee headquarters to represent another unit of the Communist Political Association. There again in this instance is no proof they are the same individuals. Identical in name only.

Mr. ROONEY. With regard No. 32, who did not go on this trip but who was previously mentioned as being one of this group, or of this orchestra, do you have the background with regard to him?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is it?

Mr. FLINN. In 1950, information of known reliability advised that No. 32 was known to him as a member of the Communist Party and had revealed that the Communist Party was demanding that he hire other members of the party to play in the orchestra with which he was then associated even if they were not found to be capable musicians.

In 1953, another informer of known reliability advised that to the best of his knowledge No. 32 continued to be associated with the Communist Party.

An informant of known reliability also indicated that No. 32 had actively supported the Jerome defense committee, a committee organized for the defense of Victor J. Jerome a member of the Communist Party, who at that time was among the defendants being tried for violation of the Smith Act.

No. 32 registered in 1948 and 1950 as having preference for the American Labor Party.

In 1949 he did not indicate his party affiliation. His wife registered for the same party during the years 1948, 1949, and 1950.

When questioned by the investigator in 1953, when queried as to whether he is now or has been a member of the Communist Party, he said he objected to the idea of people being asked concerning their personal feelings and convictions, and he added that he thinks the Communist Party should be allowed to function even though it is a radical, leftist, Marxist Party; that he did not believe that the Communist Party, as it is conducted throughout the United States, was dangerous to the internal security of the United States; believed also that the Communist Party in the United States adhered strictly to the policy of the Soviet Government, but was not directly controlled by the Comintern. He expressed the view that a member is not a potential spy, and added that the Communist Party members should be permitted to hold office with the United States Government.

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to Nos. 16, 18, 24, and 25, did a certain source of reliable information in the past, in 1951 furnish a certain list, and was there included in this list the names of Nos. 16, 18, 24, and 25, whom the informant believed to be Communists or Communist sympathizers?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Since January has there been an investigation as to all of those who went on the trip to the Orient last summer?

Mr. FLINN. There was a name check incident to the FBI inquiry of all members of the orchestra. As a part of their investigation—

Mr. ROONEY. In other words, are we assured that of the entire group that went to the Orient we now have all those with a questionable background?

Mr. FLINN. I must assume that.

Mr. ROONEY. For the reason that the available files do not disclose anything to the contrary?

Mr. FLINN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Any questions, Mr. Preston?

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I think you have covered the subject very thoroughly, and I have no questions at this point.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Sikes.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to have Mr. McIlvaine state if he knows of any attempt that has been made, of any concerted effort by the Communist-front organizations to have their personnel participate in these programs which you have discussed today.

Mr. McILVAINE. I do not know of any effort other than what has been revealed at this session.

Mr. SIKES. Have you made any effort to determine whether such effort is taking place?

Mr. McILVAINE. No. As I previously testified, we have now taken up the matter of the name check procedure.

Mr. SIKES. When did you begin that proceeding?

Mr. McILVAINE. Several weeks ago.

Mr. SIKES. Do you know anything specific that you could give us today? This is a very important question.

Mr. McILVAINE. I have this, concerning the matters that have come to us in these reports.

Mr. SIKES. Are you speaking of the good reports that have reached you about the work of this particular orchestra?

Mr. McILVAINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Do you not feel that the good impressions that may have been left in some quarters could have been more than offset by the subversive activities of some of the members of this particular orchestra?

Mr. McILVAINE. We have had no reports of any subversive activities other than the al-

<sup>1</sup> Organizations which have been designated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

<sup>2</sup> Cited as Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

legations that have been brought forward today. We have had a great many reports to the effect that the impact over there was most successful.

Mr. SIKES. I assume that you are concerned about the allegations that have been made?

Mr. McILVAINE. Yes; very much.

Mr. SIKES. About certain ones in this group.

Mr. McILVAINE. Yes; very much.

Mr. SIKES. And if those allegations are correct then there would be good reason to believe that the work done by the members of this group against the interests of the United States and the democracies, done in behalf of the Communist Party, could have more than offset the good that would have resulted from the results as far as music lovers are concerned?

Mr. McILVAINE. I do not want you to think that I believe that we should have any Communists in this program. However, the evidence that we had from the report on the trip was all favorable as far as the impact of the orchestra, as an orchestra, and we have not received any report about any deleterious activity of any individual member.

Mr. SIKES. That is perhaps true, although Mr. McILVAINE, you have not made any thorough or persistent check to determine what activities might have been engaged in by individual members of the orchestra while on the tour?

Mr. McILVAINE. No, but I received the reports from abroad, and know that they were reported on.

Mr. SIKES. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. McILVAINE, who made the arrangements for this tour?

Mr. McILVAINE. The procedure in this—

Mr. ROONEY. No; I am speaking of this particular case. Who made the arrangements to send this organization to the Orient?

Mr. McILVAINE. You mean the actual booking?

Mr. ROONEY. Who in behalf of the Government had to do with the sending of this aggregation to the Orient that cost \$267,000; who approved it?

Mr. McILVAINE. The Interagency Committee, of which I am chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Who else are members of that committee?

Mr. McILVAINE. There is on this a representative of the Information Agency.

Mr. ROONEY. Who is that?

Mr. McILVAINE. Mr. Seebach.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes. Who else?

Mr. McILVAINE. I would like to furnish the names of the Department of Labor and the Department of Defense members of this committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, the Department of Defense is on this, too?

Mr. McILVAINE. They are in it as observer.

Mr. ROONEY. Who else is in it?

Mr. McILVAINE. USIA and State are the only voting members.

Mr. ROONEY. Who finally approved this program, and how was it done?

Mr. McILVAINE. After we had received the estimate of the costs, and the gate receipts and evaluated the loss we looked over the booking arrangements in the light of recommendations from our Embassies. The funds requested were then approved by this committee.

Mr. ROONEY. When you say "we"—

Mr. McILVAINE. The committee.

Mr. ROONEY. You mean the committee?

Mr. McILVAINE. I mean the committee; yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Who are the other members of that committee that joined in approving this quarter-of-a-million-dollar trip?

Mr. McILVAINE. Frankly I shall have to furnish them to you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Can you not remember them at the moment?

Mr. McILVAINE. Not offhand. Do you have it, Mr. Batson?

Mr. BATSON. I do not have the members at that time.

Mr. McILVAINE. I do not have it before me. Mr. Chairman, I should point out that as far as the deliberations of this committee are concerned, it does not get into the security aspect. Until we get a report back on the principles of the attraction we do not give final approval. Frequently, it is decided not to go further—

Mr. ROONEY. But in this case you did not have any check, you had no report, but decided to send this aggregation to the Orient at a cost of a quarter million dollars?

Mr. McILVAINE. We had a name check—

Mr. ROONEY. Now who made the decision is the question I am asking.

Mr. McILVAINE. In addition to myself, Jules Seebach; Ralph Busick, OCB staff; he is secretary of the committee, takes the notes or minutes of the meetings.

Mr. ROONEY. Is there a coordinating board?

Mr. McILVAINE. The Operations Coordinating Board. To continue—Mr. J. L. Winfield, of the International Cooperation Administration, Lieutenant Colonel Coray, from Defense, and Mr. James Taylor from the Department of Labor.

Mr. ROONEY. Who furnished the estimate to which you referred a moment ago?

Mr. McILVAINE. As to the costs?

Mr. ROONEY. As to the details.

Mr. McILVAINE. The management of the orchestra furnished it to the American National Theater and Academy, our agent. That information is checked with travel agencies to make sure we are getting the best kind of travel arrangements.

Mr. ROONEY. Who in the orchestra furnished that?

Mr. McILVAINE. I cannot be quite sure, but I think, I believe No. 1, of the orchestra.

Mr. ROONEY. How about that, Mr. Flinn?

Mr. FLINN. We have referred to him as No. 1.

Mr. McILVAINE. We have identified him as the president of the orchestra.

Mr. ROONEY. How about No. 7?

Mr. McILVAINE. I have never heard of No. 7 before this came up. I do not know anything about him.

Mr. ROONEY. You say he was not down here in Washington on this?

Mr. McILVAINE. I know he never saw me, and Mr. Batson knows he never saw him.

Mr. ROONEY. Who else would you say, besides the party you mentioned awhile ago?

Mr. McILVAINE. We have not seen anybody, Mr. Chairman. All of these arrangements are done in New York, through the manager, with the American National Theater and Academy in this case; No. 1 I would suppose was in New York, and the individuals in the orchestra have never come to the Department, and so far as I know they did not even go to the ANTA office.

Mr. ROONEY. That is all, gentlemen, and I thank you very much for your cooperation.

You may inquire what has been done about this. At the meeting of the full Committee on Appropriations on Friday of last week, the committee unanimously directed me to turn over to the Attorney General of the United States and the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities the testimony which I have just inserted in the Record.

I expect that these agencies will take some action, because I am naive enough to expect that if President Eisenhower is going to spend \$267,000 of the taxpayers' money and needs 100 musicians to play a symphony, he can get a 100-

percent American complement for any symphony orchestra.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. COUDERT. I should like to make it perfectly clear for the Record by a question what the facts are. These musicians of whom the gentleman makes so much were not high-ranking, responsible officials in the Department of State or the Department of the Treasury, were they?

Mr. ROONEY. They were musicians. The gentleman very well knows that. They were musicians who were sent abroad at the taxpayers' expense, musicians who were given a passport by the Passport Division of the Department of State without a word of protest. I was under the impression that anyone with a record and background such as these 10 people would be unable to get a passport from the Passport Division.

Mr. COUDERT. But the gentleman does not suggest that they were policymaking officials such as was the case during the period of the prior administration.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know how high they were in policymaking positions. Maybe they had something to do with the selection of the symphony they were going to play on a particular day; I do not know. All I know is that we are informed they sent 10 people who are either presently or formerly members of the Communist Party, at Government expense, on a propaganda tour to the Orient.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I have been interested in the gentleman's statement. It indicates to me that the Department of State has an ample supply of fiddlers.

Mr. ROONEY. I guess they have some pretty good fiddlers and some pretty good oboe players, too. If we are going to send 90 decent American musicians, I do not want those 90 decent people, to use the vernacular, loused up with the kind of people whom it is reported they sent on this tour as a symphony orchestra.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for having put the material he has referred to in the hearings concerning this Symphony of the Air. I think he did a good job in bringing out the facts concerning that. But in view of the fact that the Department of State failed in its responsibility to screen these people, it is a little difficult for me to understand why he now turns around and recommends giving them \$24 million more to spend.

Mr. ROONEY. The Congress appropriated the money which was used to send these 10 Commies to the Orient, directly to President Eisenhower. The money requested before us today is to be appropriated to the Department of State.



Mr. GROSS. The Department of State certainly had some responsibility in this matter, did it not?

Mr. ROONEY. It should have.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, recently the newspapers were quite full of the fact that President Eisenhower had sent up a special request for legislation on civil rights, to strengthen the civil rights law. It is my understanding that the Attorney General, whose office is part of the Department of Justice, for which we are now about to appropriate, has always had authority to set up a Civil Rights Division and, in fact, has always had such a division.

Mr. ROONEY. There has been a Civil Rights Division down there for years. It was part of the Criminal Division, as I recall.

Mr. MULTER. And we do not need any special legislation for that?

Mr. ROONEY. Of course not.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I understand there has been a section down there devoted to civil rights, but that this request provides for an Assistant Attorney General who shall devote his full time to civil rights matters. The proposal results from numerous requests to that effect from people in both political parties.

Mr. ROONEY. I will say to the gentleman that he well knows my stand on civil rights. There has been no action taken by this subcommittee or the Committee on Appropriations which would interfere in the slightest with any plans money-wise or otherwise of the Attorney General in seeking to enforce civil rights.

Mr. SCOTT. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that. I know that he joins with me in expressing enthusiasm over the action of the House Committee on the Judiciary today in reporting out the administration civil-rights bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman for a justification for the language contained on page 22, lines 7 to 10:

That the compensation of the 5 assistant commissioners and 1 district director shall be at the rate of grade GS-16.

I am sure the gentleman will agree with me this language was subject to a point of order, but you secured from the Committee on Rules a rule waiving points of order on that question. I have read the report of the gentleman's committee and I cannot find any justification for this language.

Mr. ROONEY. The exact language contained in lines 7 to 10 on page 22 was furnished the committee by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the request that it be inserted in the bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. This language provides that the district di-

rector shall have the grade of GS-16. There are four regional commissioners. Is it not a fact that the district director is under one of the regional commissioners?

Mr. ROONEY. The district director who is intended to be given an increase in one grade which would amount to only about \$1,000 is Mr. Edward J. Shaughnessy, the district director in New York. I think that more than 50 percent of the Members on this floor on both sides of the aisle know Mr. Shaughnessy. They know him and his long and faithful service.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. My question is, he is under a regional commissioner, the regional commissioner's pay is only GS-16, yet you are placing an inferior at the same salary and the same grade as his superior.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman well knows that the position of district director in New York is the most strenuous position in the entire Immigration Service and that his position and responsibility in New York far exceeds that of, I would even venture to say, some of the assistant commissioners.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Shaughnessy is a former assistant commissioner of immigration?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. He is one of the finest public officials one could ever meet. As the gentleman says, 50 percent of the Members know him. I daresay more than 50 percent of the Members in both parties know him and deeply respect him.

Mr. ROONEY. In reply to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, may I say that everyone here knows that he is going to get this raise. So let us be practical about these things once in a while. The total amount involved in the amendment insofar as Mr. Shaughnessy is concerned is only about \$1,000.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I have no question about the honesty, integrity, and efficiency of Mr. Shaughnessy. What I am objecting to is the usurpation of the rights and privileges of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service being taken over by the gentleman's committee. The gentleman will admit that he is infringing upon the rights and prerogatives of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. ROONEY. I telephoned the gentleman, did I not, and I telephoned the ranking minority member and said, "Look, I have been asked by the Commissioner of Immigration to do thus and so. It amounts to only so much." I tried to be fair about it. I never expected we would have such a hassle as this over it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman did call me, and I want to cooperate with him.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman could cooperate fully if he would not make any remarks here on the floor with regard to this matter.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. However, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I must protect the rights and authority of my own committee. As the gentleman knows, this is clearly an infringement and usurpation of the rights of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. ROONEY. I think it is an infringement, yes. I could not say that it was not. However, it is so slight it is hardly worth while talking about.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I will yield to the gentleman but I am now going to conclude in 2 more minutes. I have made certain allotments of time and I find that I am using up most of the hour myself. I am going to be in trouble, as I was a year ago, with some of my good friends. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration are now authorized to purchase uniforms for certain foreign nationals overseas?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, they are.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is that same authority applicable to the United States Information Agency?

Mr. ROONEY. No; it is not. The committee feels that the Information Agency people ought to slip around quietly and do a good job—they do not need any uniforms.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In the case of drivers of trucks and library employees and so on, I should think that a uniform might play a very important part for the personnel.

Mr. ROONEY. We provided previously that they could wear a cap. We think that is sufficient.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Would the gentleman object to an amendment authorizing the payment for uniforms for certain foreign nationals overseas?

Mr. ROONEY. We certainly would—I assure the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I would like, if I could, to get a brief answer to this question. I notice on page 10 of the report the request for a close custody reformatory at a cost of \$7,500,000 and a maximum custody institution at a cost of \$9,500,000 is being denied. I ask this question for this reason: A number of bills are being offered to authorize those types of prisons on the ground that there has been overcrowding in our present prison facilities. I am curious to know why the request was not granted.

Mr. ROONEY. The committee did not feel that way at all. If the present number of available maximum security places were to be used, we would not need these new prisons.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am interested to see on page 3 of the bill where you provide for ice and drinking water for use abroad. How are you doing these days with the booze bill?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, they have to have some booze, you know.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes or such part thereof as I may require.

Let me say at the outset that I fully reciprocate as do my colleagues on the minority side the kind and flattering words of my good friend and neighbor from New York, the chairman of this subcommittee. Our hearings and our meetings have been singularly amicable. We have come to complete agreement. We have presented a bill which presents a consensus of opinion. The chairman himself has displayed his usual ability, energy, and consideration for the other members. All of the members have worked diligently and faithfully at this operation. And with all their diligence and all their ability, they still could not have done the job without the able, genial, and considerate gentleman who is the committee clerk, Jay B. Howe. It has been my privilege to serve as a member of a number of these subcommittees, and I have learned to have the highest respect for the staff of this committee. It is very fortunate in its staff, and it is particularly fortunate in the member of its staff who is the executive secretary of this subcommittee. I want to congratulate the subcommittee and the full committee for having the services of Mr. Howe, and I want to thank him for all that he has done to help me in my part of the work, and I am sure all the members feel alike.

Mr. Chairman, so far as the bill itself is concerned, and the appropriations for the various agencies covered, the chairman of the subcommittee has left very little for me to say, because he has said it all. If he has left anything unsaid it is in the subcommittee report. We batted around the various items. There were differences of opinion as there always are when a group of men gather around the table to discuss the various items in an appropriation bill. But we finally achieved a consensus which represents the best judgment of the group as to what funds will be required to adequately operate these many agencies during the fiscal year beginning on July 1. For my part I think it is a good bill. We have provided not all that was asked for but a very substantial part of it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that we all think it is a good bill. It does not represent the exact thoughts of everybody. It is a compromise, but when we did arrive at the various amounts we did find ourselves finally in thorough agreement.

Mr. COUDERT. And we hope that the House will agree with us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How much did the committee cut the appropriation to the United Nations, in view of the added nations that will have joined in the last year?

Mr. COUDERT. I think actually that appropriation was increased in technical respects. The exact figures are in

the report. I think there was some increase in that item. However, that was routine. The committee had absolutely no discretion in the matter. It was following obligations otherwise established by agreement.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I was afraid of—the more nations we have in there the more we spend on it. I have thought that would be considered as routine.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to answer the gentleman from Iowa that when the 16 new member nations were added they were added at a time which would not cause their dues to be reflected in the instant budget, but there will come a time, I believe within the next year, when there will be a reimbursement made to the United States on their account.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I would like to point out to the gentleman from Iowa, who has been concerned about the rule on this bill and the subcommittee usurping the rights of the legislative committees, that the legislative committees of this House have set up the formula by which the appropriation is made, and if there is objection to the amount or to the membership, it should then go to the legislative committee for correction, and not expect the Appropriations Committee to flaunt the will of the legislative committee, which has already acted.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], and I think he well knows that I have supported every amendment to cut that percentage of contribution to the United Nations.

Mr. BOW. I realize that, but the legislative committee set the amount.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe that is a valid argument for bringing this bill in under a rule waiving points of order.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I would be happy to know at what point the legislative committee of the State Department had any opportunity to consider this matter.

Mr. COUDERT. That is a question that I cannot answer. Perhaps it is addressed to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Bow.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am sorry if I misunderstood the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BOW. The legislative committee has set the percentage of the amount which will be paid to these agencies. We have nothing to do but appropriate the amount which this Government has pledged.

Mr. COUDERT. The committee was impressed and satisfied to a very large degree, with the showing made by the witnesses representing the Department; the distinguished Secretary of State and the distinguished Attorney General of the United States, both of whom happen to be constituents of mine, and I am happy to say friends of mine, and the gentleman who is the head of the USIA,

Mr. Streibert, who is also a neighbor and friend. The committee was also favorably impressed with departmental witnesses who came in support of the justifications. At the end of the trail we are satisfied that a very substantial part of the appropriations requested should be recommended to the House for action and have so recommended.

It is significant that only two criticisms my good friend from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee, undertook is to make against the State Department—often a controversial subject—and he made no criticism at all of the operations of USIA. Of the two criticisms of the State Department one was technically irrelevant, to-wit, that an orchestra sent abroad under the cultural exchange operation was found to have some Communists or near-Communists among its membership. This is very unfortunate and nobody deplores it any more than I, except as far as I personally am concerned if they would take all the people who vote Communist in the 17th Congressional District of New York and send them abroad at election I would be very much gratified, because they vote for the Democratic candidates.

The fact is that the gentleman made something of a mountain out of a molehill in dealing with this matter. If one had not listened to him with the greatest care one would have thought that these oboe players and trombone players were the ones who set policy in high places of Government.

His second criticism related to an alleged overreduction in force and appropriations in the first year of this administration in the State Department. That is a very interesting point and one to which I shall address myself. In the first place, this was the first year of a new administration after 20 uninterrupted years of the prior administration. Can anyone doubt the right of that new administration to take a new look at all of the great agencies? In the course of such new look there were changes and some reduction of force here and there based upon merit or not filling vacancies.

The fact of the matter is, and the gentleman from New York who is chairman of the subcommittee did not point this out, in the first Eisenhower fiscal year the State Department personnel was reduced from 12,000 to 9,991. But the administration did not stop at that point; it continued the same reduction in fiscal 1955 and again in fiscal 1956. Now in fiscal 1957, with a somewhat new situation developing all over the world imposing greater burdens upon our State Department, our first line of defense, that Department comes up with a request approved by the budget for some 12,800 personnel which is still some 2,000 less than in 1950.

If ever a state department or a foreign office was the front line, the first line, of defense of a great nation, the State Department is that today. Despite criticism from some sources there is general agreement that as a net result of the Geneva Conference and of developments over the last few months, world



war, shooting world war, has been definitely made more remote, and the conflict with the Soviet bloc has taken a different shape, imposing a far greater burden upon our diplomatic and other nonmilitary representatives abroad and those responsible for their operations here at home.

I would like to close that subject by pointing out that the cut in 1953 was a part of that much needed new look at Government operations in general by a new administration. That, starting from a new and strong base, is essential for several reasons. There is now facing the free world powers a shift in the international situation which requires that we, the free world, and particularly the United States, meet head-on a full-fledged Communist diplomatic offensive in all parts of the world. This offensive involves political, economic, labor, cultural, social, and many other approaches accompanied by a marked Soviet advance in military, economic, and technical fields. I think we of this subcommittee are all agreed, as we have been generally in the past, that it is of vital importance to have a strong State Department. I think we have done what is necessary to keep and improve a strong State Department.

I would like to say one more word about the USIA, always a controversial subject in some places. The recommendation is some \$22 million greater than last year, something like a 25 percent increase. The same argument goes for that, that justifies the increase in the State Department appropriations. The need for an Information Service, the need of an adequate Propaganda Service abroad, was never greater than now. Of course, they make mistakes, of course, nobody is perfect, of course, nobody has all the answers. But I think we are all agreed that we have got to make an effort to sell American policy all over the world, including the free world itself. Failing to do so, failure to have an adequate Information Service, threatens to leave parts of the world wide open to Communist diplomatic, economic, and other nonmilitary attacks.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, let me call the attention of the House to one of a series of articles by the British general, Glubb Pasha, who was thrown out of Jordan after many years in command of the Arab Legion. I shall only read the first paragraph:

The principal weapon of the "cold war," in the Middle East, at least, is words. British is being driven from the Middle East by words—words to which, with British impassivity, she refuses to reply.

Words we must have, an Information Service we must have, and every effort is being made to improve it.

A gentleman by the name of Eugene Castle, a distinguished resident of my district, has written a book criticizing the operations of the Information Service. He has written articles, he has made speeches, criticizing that Service. While the committee cannot agree with his conclusions, I have no doubt that his criticisms have led to productive self-examination by the Agency. They have

alerted this committee and other Government agencies to the possible defects in the operation of that agency and in the end have contributed to improvement in its operation.

Any kind of thoughtful criticism by well meaning persons is bound to have attention and bound to lead to some kind of self-examination.

Then there is one other small point I should like to make for the RECORD. Last year a request was originally made for funds for a book called "Profile of America." No funds were appropriated. Since that time the chairman of our subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New York, has been subject to violent pressure and some criticism on the ground that the book was banned. Let me make it clear at this point that the book, Profile of America, which a constituent and friend of mine edited, Miss Davis has never at any time been banned by this committee or any other committee. What happened was, in the committee hearings last year, there was some criticism of the use of the book as solely a propaganda instrument. Before the committee had occasion to take any action, the agency itself withdrew the request for funds.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like not only to point out to the distinguished gentleman that last year the director of the agency in writing withdrew the request that had been pending before the committee, but also that there is nothing in the instant budget in connection with the giveaway of that book as is shown at page 254 of the committee hearings, which I should like to insert, when I get permission, at this point in the RECORD.

The following is the testimony:

Mr. ROONEY. Are there any funds in here for the book you requested in the presentation program last year?

Mr. STREIBERT. No specific funds. There would be funds expended for replacements requested.

Mr. ROONEY. In the libraries overseas?

Mr. STREIBERT. In the libraries overseas.

Mr. ROONEY. But not under the presentation program?

Mr. STREIBERT. No.

There are to be no copies of that book to be given away under the presentation program.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the authoress of that book, who, I believe, is a constituent of the gentleman from New York, got out a press release last March 27 in which she spoke of my trying "to embarrass an agency" I "do not like." Why, I have been fighting for and on occasion defending the information program since its inception many years ago. She also said in her prepared press release that "Mr. ROONEY had the Senate amendment thrown out at conference." That would make me more important than I am. And, when she appeared before the committee this year, she said in her press release, "Mr. ROONEY again attacked the USIA." Well, all this is a tissue of lies, and I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD what Mr. Streibert, the director of the Agency, had to say at the conclusion of many days of hearings on the appropriation request for the USIA.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. ROONEY. The House has again made its historical investigation of your appropriations.

Mr. STREIBERT. Mr. Chairman, may I say this on the record.

This is the third time I have appeared before this subcommittee. The first time you, Mr. Chairman, I think, were the ranking minority member and twice you have been chairman, and I want to say that as a result of all this experience I think that the searching inquiry you conduct and the ability to get everything out on the record, to call to account those in the Agency that are administering these funds, is of great benefit to the Agency and is not only a salutary process but a necessary process in Government operation, and while at some points in the records in the past—and I hope not too often—there may have been some contention on my part, I want to apologize for any such contentious attitude now.

Mr. ROONEY. That is utterly unnecessary, Mr. Streibert. If I were seated in your place on the other side of the table, I would probably be more contentious than you could ever be. We thoroughly understand your position on these things. We try to probe into them, understanding your zealotness and interest in the program. There is not a question of doubt that you are trying to do a good job. So your interest is easily understood.

On this side of the table we try to look at it from the viewpoint of the taxpayer and try to ascertain whether or not he is getting his money's worth.

Mr. STREIBERT. Quite properly. You have been very fair and if I may be permitted, if it is not presumptuous, I would say you have shown extraordinary ability in that respect.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say as far as I am concerned I have the greatest respect and admiration for the Secretary of State. I believe that he is doing a magnificent job under the most difficult conditions. I am very happy that this committee has decided to follow his recommendations with respect to strengthening and enlarging the Department which is his instrument of action. The Attorney General continues to maintain a great department, and I think is entitled to all the support we can give him. Mr. Streibert has an exceedingly difficult job. I think he is doing it well. I think it may be improved. I think the additional funds will result in better representation of the United States, its policies and its interests, abroad.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have read the hearings rather carefully, but nowhere could I find where the committee gave any consideration as to the amount of current funds for UNESCO to be redeemed in American dollars. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. COUDERT. I do not think I know what the gentleman has reference to.

Mr. GROSS. Well, they are issuing what are called coupons redeemable in American dollars, carrying on transactions as between foreigners and purchasable goods in this country. The coupons are issued in denominations of 1, 3, 10, 30, and 100 dollars.

Mr. COUDERT. You mean like PX coupons?

Mr. GROSS. No. I mean that a Scotsman can buy a book in this country and give UNESCO coupons in payment for it, and it will be redeemed in American dollars.

Mr. COUDERT. I should be happy to yield to any other member of the committee who can answer that question.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the committee will give some consideration to this new form of world currency for this one-world organization.

Mr. COUDERT. If that is so, unless there is some other answer, the obvious answer is that that is part of the U. N. arrangement, to which we are parties by contract; and there is nothing that this committee could do about it, anyway.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. CANNON, such time as he may require.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I would like to endorse the low-priced books program of the United States Information Agency. This is one activity where the Information Agency will actually compete with the Soviets. What has been a complete vacuum in the availability of American books at prices people can afford overseas will be filled under the present program. The Agency requested funds for mass editions of some 500 separate titles, which will put into commercial circulation 22 million books, worldwide. Certainly with the threat that confronts us on all sides, this number would hardly begin to scratch the surface. I am assuming this is only a beginning and that an expanded program will be developed. I urge that we make certain that this beginning be pushed to the extent that capabilities will allow and that the Agency be encouraged to expand this low-priced books program to its full potentialities.

According to testimony by United States Information Agency officials before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Soviet Russia alone turns out more than 50,000 titles a year and more than a billion books in all. This means that 200 million books are available from the Soviet Union alone for free or low-cost distribution worldwide. To meet this, we are asked to support a program, which will yield 22 million books. The figures speak for themselves. Even with this low-priced books program, the Soviet Union will still be distributing almost 10 times as many books as we do.

In my opinion, this threat must be met, and, further, we must reach the point quickly where the Soviet saturation of worldwide markets is neutralized and overcome by our program of making our best books available at 10 cents per copy to foreign readers.

It is interesting to note the warm endorsement of this activity by the Washington Post and Times Herald. I in-

clude excerpts from the editorial in this morning's edition:

#### STRENGTHENING USIA

The House of Representatives is scheduled to take up today the budget request for the United States Information Agency. The Appropriations Committee was neither ungenerous nor indiscriminating in its treatment of the Agency.

We hope that the House will give USIA enough money to insure an expansion of its tremendously valuable program of distributing inexpensive editions of significant books. The House needs to think of the whole USIA program as an important element in the contest going on today for men's minds.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished chairman and members of the subcommittee and with particular reference to the hearings on the budget of the United States Information Agency for a job well done. I know the chairman and the committee members took into account the new and most serious international situation which has been created by the latest shift in tactics by the Kremlin in arriving at a budget figure of \$110 million for the United States Information Agency. I speak about the intensified Communist campaign for peaceful coexistence and the startling success which has already attended their efforts to confuse, divide, and weaken the free world.

I believe it is worth noting in connection with the consideration of the budget of the United States Information Agency the performance by the two Kremlin top peddlers of veiled tyranny now visiting Great Britain. The tour of Great Britain by Khrushchev and Bulganin is a calculated part of the Kremlin propaganda offensive against the United States and all other free people. Only yesterday, thinking people were shocked to hear Communist Party boss Khrushchev openly threaten the good people of Great Britain with the prospect of the Russians soon having at their command an intercontinental guided missile bearing a hydrogen warhead. Khrushchev obviously believes that by this device he can frighten the British people and their leaders into a position of peaceful surrender. Undoubtedly he feels that since the British people underwent the horrors, the trials, and the heartbreaks of air bombings and attacks by the V-1 and V-2 rockets of the Hitler period that they would be willing to pay any price in order to escape even greater devastation caused by A-bombs or H-bombs. Khrushchev cleverly points out to the British people that they must either accept coexistence, the tyranny of communism, or plunge themselves into the horrors of atomic warfare. He excluded any possible third course of action. This is a brutal demonstration of the Russian tactic of diplomacy by ultimatum.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that Members of this House recall the Russian diplomacy by ultimatum which brought the enslavement of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithu-

ania. That same Russian diplomacy by ultimatum brought about the enslavement and communization of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, and the other nations of the Russian Communist empire. That is the final prospect behind Communist Party Boss Khrushchev's bold and defiant statement made in England.

Mr. Chairman, I joined with five of my colleagues in presenting a statement before the subcommittee of which the distinguished gentleman [Mr. ROONEY], is chairman, advocating support for the United States Information Agency in order that it could carry out the all important task of winning the struggle for the minds and hearts of men everywhere in the world. I feel the amount granted should permit the Information Agency the opportunity to expand its activities in the most critical areas so as to expose the latest Communist propaganda offensive for the cruel fake that it is. Moreover, I believe that the committee should be complimented for its action in granting elasticity for the Director of United States Information Agency in determining how cuts made in the budget request are to be applied to the program he has set forth for the next fiscal year, together with elasticity in the use of authorized funds to meet any contingency that may come up during the next year. I have one additional observation. The United States Information Agency requested \$250,000 for representation purposes in the next fiscal year and the committee approved only \$50,000, the same as that approved for the present fiscal year. In view of the fact that the committee approved an increase of \$125,000 for representation funds for the Department of State, and I heartily approve and commend them for this action, I regret the committee did not increase the necessary representation funds for the United States Information Agency. I say this because of my own personal experiences of last fall while on an official inspection trip of southeast Asia and north Asia. I observed the work of the United States Information Agency in all these countries. To cite one example, upon questioning the public affairs officer in Bangkok I was advised that for a period of 1 year he had a total sum of \$1,200 to cover all representation costs in Thailand, which you and I know is of the greatest strategic value and importance to the freedom of all of Asia. With this small fund he explained how he divided it among the four regional public affairs offices and among the principal officers in charge of the central operation including the office responsible for cooperation with the armed forces of Thailand. I also took the opportunity while in Thailand to visit the most distant outpost of the United States Information Agency located in the heart of the jungle. I made this trip in a United States Army plane; otherwise, it would have taken days of travel by jeep and riverboat. The regional public affairs officer was a young and vigorous American who had won the respect and admiration of all the people I talked to at the provincial headquarters office. He and



his family stood out as symbols of America to all the people in that region. Upon questioning him I learned that he had an annual allotment of \$12.00 for representation. Yet the principal means by which he carried on his important mission was by contact with the provincial authorities, the local military authorities, and a teachers' training college. Anyone can see that he could not carry on the functions required of him on \$1 a month for representation and that he had to use his own personal funds to get the job done. I could cite other examples of the need for an increased representation fund in order for the United States Information Agency officers to do their job properly.

In Japan I observed the work of one of the principal officers who was responsible for the development and distribution of publications in the Japanese language explaining the United States position on critical questions. He had other functions which were of great importance. Upon questioning, he told me that in his efforts to help the non-Marxist professors in the Japanese colleges and universities, his best approach was informal gatherings and sessions to which the Communists could not attach suspicion. He stated bluntly there were no funds available for him to arrange and carry out these informal gatherings and that consequently these expenses came out of his own pocket.

It is for these reasons that I had hoped that the United States Information Agency officials in the field would not be required to take up so much slack.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS].

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point up a situation which I am quite sure the committee has taken cognizance of in the deliberations which led to this appropriation bill. It is a situation which is important for all of us to think about as we consider this legislation, as I have the feeling that we are going to be concerned with this particular problem for some time.

I refer to page 103 of the printed hearings before the subcommittee, and particularly to the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Merchant, now Ambassador Designate to Canada. On page 103 in his testimony he discusses the living conditions in Moscow, and this is what he says:

We have a very bad housing situation in Moscow, Mr. Chairman. This refers to a building known as America House, which is about 3 miles from the chancery. It houses male American clerks, 11 or 12 of them, and 21 marine guards.

They are huddled into 18 single rooms for the combined total. They are away from the Embassy community, and they are living, really, under unbearable conditions.

There is a security problem there and a morale problem. We don't think any amount of renovation can improve the basic deficiencies of America House.

The Embassy now is trying to lease a six-story building adjoining the Chaikovsky Building where we have most of our other staff. This includes alterations and proper furnishing of the quarters in that new building to be leased.

Then in addition there is a critical officer housing situation in Moscow. We have had

to limit assignment to Moscow to officers who are either unmarried or had no more than two children due to the lack of proper available quarters.

As you know, we are working on and I believe it important to develop an intensified language and area training course for officers specializing in the Soviet Union. That requires their being assigned to Moscow during part of their training.

We don't want to be in a position where we have to limit the selection of such officers by reason of their having more than two children.

There are going to be problems, I think, in building there. This is designed to provide the funds to correct what is really a very bad situation.

Mr. Merchant asked for \$153,000 for improvements in the living conditions in Moscow of single male clerks. I understand that the appropriation is included in this legislation and will be allocated for that purpose when the legislation becomes law and the budget officer in the Department of State considers the allocation. Along with many of my colleagues, I had an opportunity to visit the Soviet Union and five of the satellite countries last fall. I had an opportunity, as did many of you, to study the living conditions of our people who represent us in this most hostile area.

Anyone who has studied the job being done by the Foreign Service personnel behind the Iron Curtain cannot help but come back with two conclusions—one is the outstanding job that is really being done. It is not at all uncommon for our people there to work 24 hours a day for days at a time. Second, they are working under extremely difficult conditions. For example, consider the living conditions in Moscow. I just touched on the American House in reporting the testimony of Mr. Merchant. We found also that at the Embassy itself there are a number of our people who live and work under the same roof. They must contend with the fact that Soviet listening devices are being used to record their every conversation. We found also that the condition of the building is such that they go without elevator service for weeks at a time. Sometimes in the coldest part of the winter, there is no such thing as hot water. We rent the Embassy at Moscow from the Russians for about \$1 million a year. Nevertheless, we found that the Russians have not been very cooperative in making necessary improvements.

We also found at the time I was in Russia, last fall, that there were only two members of our Embassy staff who had licenses to drive automobiles which means that when most of our people want to go anywhere they must have a Russian driver. This further limits what they can see and do and what they can say. All in all, the people who represent us in Moscow are today living as virtual prisoners and operating under extremely difficult conditions.

The same is true in the satellite countries. We found there at one of the legations that Foreign Service officers after they have finished a 10- or 14-hour day often have to strap on a gun, put down an army cot in the building and pull guard duty for the rest of the night because the housing conditions are so short

(or at least the Communist officials in this satellite country say they are so short) that we are not allowed housing for a Marine Guard. Therefore, we cannot bring our Marine Guard in and the Foreign Service personnel do guard duty as well as the rest of the work at the Embassy or legation.

Despite the fact that some people might misunderstand, I suggest that we send the very latest of our American inventions, particularly in the case of automobiles, to the people who represent us behind the Iron Curtain. We must remember that the Communists have a completely materialistic society and when they see a modern American day automobile or a modern American television set; in fact, when they see a well-dressed American walk through the streets, they begin to wonder about what life must really be like in this land so far from Russia where they have been told that the people live like slaves under a capitalistic system. I was amazed and shocked to find that our personnel behind the Curtain have been driving old dilapidated vehicles that cannot possibly match vehicles also American made which are used by some of the other foreign countries that are represented there.

In one case, we found that a station wagon—a moderately priced station wagon which had been brought to one of the countries behind the Iron Curtain and purchased at his own expense by an American warrant officer—caused crowds of some several hundred to gather and look at it and ask us if it was true that in America working men could have station wagons like that. We found that sometimes a modern American car created good will for us in telling what life is like in this capitalistic system than some of the other things we have done and are doing.

This suggestion to give to better provide for the people who represent us in a difficult area behind the Iron Curtain is not for their comfort alone but because it helps us advertise the fact that here in this country we have the highest standard of living in the world. It will show the people in Communist areas that this is the sort of thing that they could have if they would abandon their totalitarian form of government and seek a better life under a system of individual freedom.

I congratulate the American Foreign Service for the fine job it is doing.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I congratulate the gentleman for that suggestion which seems to me to be a very sound one. I have noted with great admiration the recommendations which the gentleman from California made after his recent trip to Russia. My hope and wish is that every Member of the Congress would take as seriously as the gentleman from California did the investigation made on his recent trip and the excellent suggestions which the gentleman made on his return.

Mr. HILLINGS. I thank the gentleman from New York very much.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have seen but few bills come to this floor on which there has been more complete accord within the committee. We have been most fortunate in having a chairman who was able to exercise great skill and great tact. This naturally has helped to smooth out differences of opinion so that we could come here in agreement on this very important measure.

I do not think there is anyone who will deny that the State Department is the first line of America's defense in time of peace. Consequently, it must be a strong organization—strong in ideas, strong in personnel, strong in purpose, and strong in policy. Otherwise America and the world can suffer materially from the failure of America's objectives for the peace and welfare of mankind.

Three years ago we saw drastic reductions imposed in funds and in personnel in the State Department. To many of us it appeared at the time that these cuts were dangerously deep, and that in some important areas of activity they were crippling cuts. Now, in contrast for the second year, we are seeing a step-up in funds and personnel in the State Department. That damage that many people saw then is now being repaired. But also, Mr. Chairman, during these last 2 years we have seen a great step-up in the scope of Communist intrigue—in area, in intensity, and, unfortunately, in effectiveness. Who knows; perhaps by our own actions we helped to encourage and to invite that buildup of Communist activity and effectiveness and the accompanying buildup of our own troubles abroad—and certainly there has been a buildup in our own troubles abroad.

But that is all water over the dam. We will do well to recognize from this point henceforth that our State Department can make us or break us in this complex modern age. It should have our support, and that support should include adequate funds. By the same token the State Department must, by its own actions and accomplishments, justify the support that it needs. Obviously, this can never be accomplished except on a plane that is above politics.

May I now take this opportunity to compliment the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who has, I believe, contributed substantially to national security by developing the fact that there is gross carelessness or negligence in the manner in which people are selected to go abroad as the representatives of the culture and the civilization which America has developed. When Communists are sent abroad by our Government, and when they preach their wares abroad under the auspices of our Government, eyebrows undoubtedly go up as people speculate on what is taking place and what we are countenancing, to say the very least. Quite obviously, then, this administration is subject to the same weaknesses in the conduct of policy that it had claimed to find so shocking in previous administrations. But I find no indication of any effort to clean up this situation whose existence has been so

effectively portrayed by our subcommittee. That failure to step in and drastically go to work to clean up this situation is to me as disturbing as the fact that it was found to exist.

Again let me say that we have, I think, a good bill. It is a bill on which we are all in complete accord. We have saved money, we have prescribed a slower buildup than was requested by the administration, but I believe that we shall have a stronger and a more effective organization in the State Department as the result of the action of our committee.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest joy that I find the committee and also the State Department itself planning broader ways, deeper ways, and higher ways of helping build the Foreign Service that we must have. At this moment we should be extending ourselves and expending our energies and imaginations and good sense in building the greatest Foreign Service the world has ever seen.

I was particularly delighted that my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. HILLINGS] gave us the facts he did about the Moscow situation. That is a particularly dramatic situation but there are many difficult posts to which we need to give our best attention.

I spent 3½ months in Africa during the recess. While there I went to all our consulates, embassies, and liaison offices with the exception of Alexandria and Somaliland. I was impressed with what we are asking of our representatives in the Foreign Service, and very proud of the much that is being given. May I give you a picture or two? At one post we were somewhat understaffed. Conditions could perhaps have been improved a little by better administration, but one question is in that climate. Staff houses were prefabricated houses with iron window frames, and they were far from new. In that wet climate the iron had rusted badly so that it rained through the windows. Young mothers could not dry their children's diapers, and the only way they could put a dry diaper on a child was to put it in the oven or iron it with a hot iron. That is something you men have not had to contend with, babies or diapers, but most of the rest of us have, and these conditions are not easy to take smilingly.

Then in another area the only house available for one of the members of the staff who had a young wife was opposite the public latrines. That entire city works on a bucket system, and at 4:30 in the afternoon all those buckets are emptied. It was quite impossible to invite anyone to visit after 4 o'clock in the afternoon. I took my hat off to those young people who were taking it right on their chins.

I found upon later inquiry that certain restrictions we here on the Hill put on expenditures are at the root of what seemed to me as poor economy as I had ever seen. A new man often spends months looking for a house when

very often the man who preceded him had one which under better methods of procedure could have been held for the newcomer.

It is a relief to know that we are going to increase the number of our consulates in Africa. Unless we move into Africa more rapidly than we are doing we are going to be in a very bad way in this rapidly changing world.

We face a new Embassy in the new nation of the Sudan—the possibility of one in the Gold Coast and a third in the soon to be free Nigeria.

I believe that there is intention on the part of the State Department to open four new consulates right across the middle of Africa, a rapidly growing harbor of the French Ivory Coast, 1 at Abidjan, 1 at Douala in the French Cameroons, 1 at Uganda, and 1 in the new nation which will come into being in 1960 out of the Italian Somaliland. All this is excellent, and gives rise to great hopes. I trust that we are going to make it possible for people who have some training in the kind of work they will have to do, to have a capacity to be human beings to the people with whom they deal. I trust we will choose our people with as much conscience and as much intelligence as it is humanly possible to do, because I am convinced that in Africa particularly—and this is true all over the world—if we go there with our hearts, with understanding, and show these people that we are interested in them as individuals because, like ourselves, they are part of the essence of the Being of Almighty God. If we prove to them by what we do that we want to know them, want to work with them, we will create a climate and an atmosphere that will make it absolutely impossible for any Communist to come between us.

May I commend the committee for the results they have achieved in this bill. I do not agree with all of it—but it seems to me that the bill as a whole is forward looking and constructive. We shall all of us watch with interest the use the Departments make of the funds so appropriated.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of clearing up a misconception regarding one item of the State Department budget which has existed in our Foreign Affairs Committee. I refer to the item with regard to a contribution to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund.

At the bottom of page 6 of the bill that we have under consideration appears an item of \$1,304,000. I understand that there was in a supplemental appropriation bill which passed the House recently an item of \$1,200,000. I further understand that is the first appropriation that has been made for payment to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund since 1950.

Just recently on the floor of the House we passed a conference report to increase slightly the annuities for some of the older retired Foreign Service officers. At that time we were under the impression in the committee that the



Foreign Service retirement and disability fund was more or less self-supporting. We find apparently that is not so, that even though the payments into the fund greatly exceed the payments out of the fund—that is, the benefits to the members—the fund itself is apparently not self-supporting. I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New York, if that is correct and if under present circumstances it is anticipated that we will have to ask for an annual appropriation to keep this fund bolstered up, to keep it moving, is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is correct in both parts of his statement. The fund is not self-supporting. The requested appropriation this year is to place the fund on a sound year-to-year basis. It would seem that during the past year a number of things happened which were quite unusual with regard to the fund and, if I may use the expression, it was thrown out of kilter. It is expected that in the future there would be further contributions.

Mr. BENTLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that before our Foreign Affairs Committee at the present time there is pending a bill, S. 3481, to amend the Foreign Service Act, which includes among many other provisions, further liberalization and an increase in benefits from the fund itself. In view of the fact that the payments by members, by participants in the fund, are only at the rate of 5 percent, I am wondering if the gentleman thinks this system should be allowed to go on or if we should not look into the possibility of raising the rate of contribution with the idea of putting the fund on a self-sustaining basis so that we will not have to make these annual contributions.

Mr. ROONEY. We are certainly now in a very peculiar situation. The committee saw fit a while ago to write some unimportant legislation, the consequence of which was an expenditure of about \$3,600 for 3 grade 16 employees, and now a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs asks the Committee on Appropriations such a question. It seems to me that this is entirely a matter for the gentleman's committee, and if the gentleman and his committee passes the bill to which the gentleman has referred and also passes bills such as any number of others pending which would increase our share in the United Nations Organizations, why, the Committee on Appropriations has no alternative but to pay the dues of our uncle, Uncle Sam. We have no alternative.

Mr. BENTLEY. This gentleman would like to disassociate himself with respect to some of those United Nations bills which the gentleman has mentioned. Did the State Department mention anything in connection with this annuity whether this might be an annual appropriation?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; the State Department did.

Mr. BENTLEY. And approximately in the same amount in the future?

Mr. ROONEY. It would vary. It might become larger and it might decrease. It would all depend in the par-

ticular year what the circumstances were.

Mr. BENTLEY. But under the present setup the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund is definitely not self-supporting?

Mr. ROONEY. It is not.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman for that information, because that is distinctly contrary to the impression that our committee had, an impression which we received from the State Department, which was premised on the fact that for a period of approximately 6 years there were no appropriations for the fund, and this supplemental appropriation which contains this \$1,200,000 was the first appropriation in the past 6 years. Is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee for the information developed during the hearings. I do regret, however, that the chairman of the subcommittee and the members thereof saw fit to go off the record on about every other page. I found, in reading the hearings, I got to some important information, and then suddenly the subcommittee would go off the record, and certainly in most instances it was not classified information.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested to read in the hearings that we are now buying \$27 wastepaper baskets for the State Department that is, \$27 apiece; and \$60 each for telephone stands for the State Department. It seems to me that a \$27 wastepaper basket must be gold plated or have some platinum or something on it. I cannot understand why the taxpayers should be supplying the State Department with \$27 wastepaper baskets. I get along pretty well in my office with some of those dollar and a half steel numbers. They do a pretty good job of catching the debris. So, just remember that you have been buying \$27 wastepaper baskets for the State Department along with \$60 telephone stands. And, I expect that when we build a new State Department building there will be plenty of them. The only reason given as to why they need these super-doooper baskets and telephone stands is that they match their desks. I leave to your imagination the kind of desks they have.

In studying the hearings, I was surprised to note the scant attention accorded the activities of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

I was particularly surprised that no mention is made at any place in the printed hearings to the matter of UNESCO paying off during the past year several American employees of UNESCO who had been fired for refusing to appear before a loyalty board of the United States Civil Service Commission.

I would be interested to hear from the chairman of the subcommittee as to why

this was not discussed during the hearings. Surely the Congress has some interest in the matter with American taxpayers contributing 30 percent of UNESCO's budget; funds from which were used to pay off these individuals.

Since the committee did not question State Department witnesses concerning these payoffs, I want to call attention to the facts as I have been able to piece them together.

On April 26, 1955, a three-man administrative tribunal of the International Labor Organization handed down a ruling that UNESCO must reinstate three dismissed American employees or pay them damages totaling \$43,800. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that three foreigners—a Belgian, a Frenchman, and a Dutchman—made up that three-man tribunal.

Immediately upon learning of the ruling, I wrote to Dr. Luther Evans, Director General of UNESCO, in an effort to obtain full particulars.

In reply, he said among other things that:

I would not be in a position to execute judgment of the tribunal until UNESCO's executive board has had an opportunity to decide whether it wishes to appeal to the International Court of Justice, and whether I may draw from the working capital fund to pay any necessary amounts to individuals concerned.

The so-called International Court of Justice, by the way, is the one on which sit judges from Communist Poland, Communist Russia, and Communist Yugoslavia, and which in 1954 ruled in a similar case that 11 dismissed American employees of the United Nations must be paid \$180,000 in back salaries and damages.

Dr. Evans also advised me that the State Department was fully informed concerning the case, so I then wrote to David McKendrew Key, at that time Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, in an effort to find out what the State Department was doing or planned to do in regard to the ruling.

Mr. Key replied that—

The Department of State disagrees strongly with these decisions. We plan to do everything possible, within the terms of Article 12 of the Tribunal Statute to obtain redress.

On November 10, 1955, I again wrote to Dr. Evans for a report on the status of the case, as well as on information I had received that the ILO Tribunal had handed down another ruling involving more dismissed American employees of UNESCO.

Dr. Evans replied under date of November 30, 1955, and I quote from his letter:

I would like to mention, first of all, that, on October 29, 1955, the tribunal rendered an identical decision in the case of a fourth staff member.

Remember, this is No. 4. In his case, the ILO tribunal ruled that he must be paid \$12,800 damages, \$300 costs, 4 percent interest from January 1, 1955, and children's allowance for 2 years, totaling \$800. All of this, of course, is added to the total of \$43,800 awarded the other three dismissed employees.

In his letter, Dr. Evans goes on to say that—

The executive board, on November 18, 1955, adopted the following resolution:

"That the executive board, acting under article XII of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization, challenge the judgments rendered by the administrative tribunal in the cases of Leff, Duberg, Wilcox, and Bernstein, and submit the question of their validity to the International Court of Justice."

From past performance by the so-called Court of Justice in the case of dismissed American employees of the United Nations, it is pretty obvious what the decision of the Court will be, and I do not hesitate to predict that it will not be favorable to the United States.

In fact, even Dr. Evans apparently knows what the decision will be, because in his November 30, 1955, letter, he says:

The executive board, on November 25, 1955, approved the advance payment of one-third of the amount of compensation ordered by the administrative tribunal in these four cases, on the condition that the persons concerned undertake to pay back to the Organization the amount, if any, by which these payments exceed any sum to which they will be entitled on final settlement of these cases in accordance with the advisory opinion to be rendered by the International Court of Justice.

How do you like that? These four individuals were paid off one-third of the amount of compensation ordered, even though the executive board of UNESCO challenged the judgments.

And note that Dr. Evans does not say that they will be made to pay back the money if the International Court rules against them. He says they should undertake to pay it back.

But that is not all. On October 29, 1955, the administrative tribunal of the International Labor Organization rendered a judgment in three additional cases involving American staff members of UNESCO who had refused to testify before a United States Loyalty Board. Dr. Evans or UNESCO's executive board did not challenge this decision, and on November 26, 1955, these individuals were paid off as follows:

Miss R. Froma, \$11,289.37 in settlement of the judgments made by the ILO Tribunal, and in addition 3 months' base salary plus cost-of-living adjustment, in lieu of notice, \$1,431.56; 5 months' termination indemnity at rate of pensionable remuneration, \$2,250; 70½ days' accumulated annual leave at rate of pensionable remuneration, \$1,464.23; 6 weeks' repatriation grant at rate of pensionable remuneration, \$623.07.

Miss H. Van Gelder, \$6,870.36, in settlement of the judgments, plus \$998.45, \$2028.57, \$546.15, and \$39.11.

Mrs. K. Pankey, \$5,062.06 in settlement of the judgments, plus \$585, \$390, and \$292.50.

That all adds up to a total of \$34,221.43 received by the three individuals.

From where did the money come to pay off these American employees of UNESCO, fired for refusing to appear before a United States loyalty board?

From UNESCO's working capital fund, Dr. Evans informs me. And what are the sources of revenue of the working

capital fund of UNESCO? I quote article 6.2 of UNESCO's financial regulations:

There shall be established a working capital fund in an amount and for purposes to be determined from time to time by the general conference. The source of moneys of the working capital fund shall be advances from member states, and these advances made in accordance with the scale of assessments as determined by the General Conference for the apportionment of the expenses of UNESCO shall be carried to the credit of the member states which have made such advances.

Get that: "and these advances made in accordance with the scale of assessments as determined by the General Conference." This is the scale of assessments in which the United States is listed as contributing 30 percent of UNESCO's budget.

In other words, American taxpayers' money was used to pay off these individuals, despite the clear intent of Congress in unanimously approving House Concurrent Resolution 262 during the 2d session of the 83d Congress. That resolution stated:

That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States delegation to the United Nations should take all possible steps to prevent the General Assembly of the United Nations from authorizing or approving the payment to the 11 American employees in the United Nations who were dismissed because of their refusal under the fifth amendment to answer proper questions before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, of the awards of damages (in a total amount of \$179,420) made by the United Nations Administrative Tribunal and recently upheld by the International Court of Justice, and that no part of the funds heretofore appropriated, or hereafter appropriated by the Congress for the United Nations shall be used for the payment of such awards.

Surely it was not the intent of this Congress for the resolution to apply only to the matter of 11 dismissed American employees of the U. N.

But now we have similar cases involving employees of UNESCO, a specialized agency of the United Nations, but to my knowledge, and from Dr. Evans' letters to me, nothing was done on the part of American representatives at the U. N. or UNESCO, or by the State Department, to prevent the use of American taxpayers' money to pay off the 4 individuals in full and one-third of the amounts set by the ILO tribunal to 3 others.

On the record, it is apparent that the dirt is still being swept under the rug at UNESCO. And that phrase in connection with UNESCO is not original with me, I assure you. In fact, I borrow it from no less than the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, United States Ambassador to the United Nations, who, in testifying last year on UNESCO before the same subcommittee handling this bill today, had this to say:

The thing to do is to improve it and not sweep the dirt under the rug, which is what was being done. I am being frank.

I repeat: On the record, it is apparent that the dirt is still being swept under the rug at UNESCO.

Apparently there is only one solution to this whole sorry mess, and that is to cut off all United States funds for

UNESCO, for the UNESCO propaganda machine at the State Department—the so-called UNESCO Relations Staff—and for the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I am very much concerned about the matter to which the gentleman has referred as well as with regard to the resolution adopted by the American Legion at its convention in Miami.

Mr. GROSS. I applaud the resolution adopted by the American Legion at Miami.

Mr. ROONEY. I took this matter up with the Department of State and was advised over the signature of Loy W. Henderson, Under Secretary of State, as follows:

The Secretary has authorized me to inform you that it is our conviction that our national interest will best be served by continued participation in this specialized agency of the United Nations, and by maintaining a strong advisory body, such as the United States National Commission, to help the Government in its effort to strengthen and improve the program and operations of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Mr. GROSS. Who pays his salary? Mr. ROONEY. The salary of Mr. Dulles?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. The taxpayers pay his salary the same as the taxpayers pay the salary of the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, who presented the budget requesting these funds.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and Dulles needs this UNESCO propaganda machine to keep him going; does he not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I get it, at the hearings when the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] was asking one of these gentlemen who represents us about how many men were in the department, he said something like 1,200 and then when you go through the hearings you find there were 2,900; is that not right?

Mr. ROONEY. I think your figures are way off. Probably the gentleman is referring to the highly misleading recent editorial in the Chicago Tribune. If that is so, he is now as inaccurate as were the contents of that editorial. The figures in that editorial were utterly incorrect.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean the figures are all wrong? I thought you were asking how many employees there were and finally it shows up different.

Mr. ROONEY. No, I do not ask—we have the correct figures here.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How many have they—are they not paying 2,900?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know where the gentleman took the figure 2,900 from.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You seem to think it was from the Chicago



Tribune editorial. Maybe it was. I will look it up.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman might have just misread a decimal point—I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I say in conclusion that what Secretary Dulles has to say about UNESCO does not impress me for one-half of one second. He has one of the best little propaganda machines going for UNESCO that he could have anywhere. I do not care what he says about it pro or con.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, peace will come to this old troubled world of ours and victory will light on the banners of democracy only when we have won the war for the hearts and minds of men.

Until now we have been losing that war. Today is the turning point. What we are doing this day will have profound repercussions all over the world. I think it is safe to say that, measured in the future by the result of the action we now are taking, today will go down as a day of great historical significance. It marks the beginning of the frontal decisive attack in the war for the minds and hearts of men that up to this day of decision has been going steadily against us.

It was the force of reason that gave strength in vision and in deed to those who built for the dignity of man a fortress of democracy on American shores. There is no difference among men of various races and nationalities in common physical needs and in their basic desires and aspirations. The force of reason will be generated in any country and in any clime, in relatively equal measure, when the sources for reasoning are available and in a form of presentment to make them understandable. This I believe.

What we are doing today is to make available to mankind in every clime and translated into every tongue the classics of American democracy that are the sources of the eternal truths of government by, of, and for the people, government that upholds the dignity of all men and respects the purposes of the Creator of both men and nations.

#### CLASSICS FOR ALL THE WORLD

My colleagues will recall that a year ago when the appropriations of 1956 were under consideration I offered an amendment to provide for funds for a Classics of American Democracy program. While the amendment was ruled out on a point of order, the suggestion embodied in the amendment, I am happy to say, was sympathetically received by the House. That was a year ago. Much has happened in the intervening time. Later in my remarks I shall sketch briefly the events that marked the progress of an idea and its growth in the brief period of about a year into reality.

The important point is that with the increased appropriation for USIA in the bill now under consideration, and with the endorsement and cooperation of the

commission on books of which the distinguished Dr. Mark May is chairman, and under the able guidance and experienced direction of USIA, the Classics of Democracy that inspired our forefathers are to be made available to peoples everywhere in inexpensive editions and translated into many tongues.

Heretofore these works were available only in the larger libraries and in editions priced beyond ordinary reach. There were few translations, none at all of some of our most precious national documents. Now they are to go on sale in the book stalls of the world, selling at prices comparable to those for which the literature of the Soviet is sold, and translated by outstanding scholars.

#### ON SALE IN ORIENT MAY 1

I am happy to be able to report that on May 1, now only a few days away, the following books in paper back editions will go on sale in the Far East at the prices given:

John Adams, Political Writings, 223 pages, 15 cents.

John C. Calhoun, Disquisition on Government, 104 pages, 10 cents.

Benjamin Franklin, Autobiography, Other Writings, 218 pages, 15 cents.

Thomas Jefferson, Representative Selections, 15 cents.

Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, Selections from the Federalist, 231 pages, 15 cents.

Henry D. Thoreau, Selected Writings on Nature and Liberty, 10 cents.

Thomas Paine, Common Sense, 184 pages, 15 cents.

From the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution: Roots of American Constitutionalism, 71 pages, 10 cents.

Lord Charnwood's Abraham Lincoln, 501 pages, 10 cents.

#### WILL MEET SOVIET PRICES

This is the first time that American classics have been sold at prices comparable to those at which communistic books have been sold. With no publicity, the advance orders ran over 5,000 copies in a week. This is an index of the interest at grassroots level. It is in a field that heretofore we have not touched, leaving it to be monopolized by the Soviet. Now we are moving in, and I can assure my colleagues that what we are doing today in supplying the funds for the expansion of the present USIA pilot program will have tremendous results in our war to win the minds and hearts of people everywhere.

Within a matter of months our American classics will be translated into 25 languages, printed and distributed by local dealers in the respective countries, and sold in all the bookstalls of the foreign world at 10 and 15 cents a copy. Too much credit cannot be given American book publishers for their fine cooperation in developing a program from which their only return will be the satisfaction of rendering a patriotic service.

#### GRATITUDE DUE SUBCOMMITTEE

The distinguished and most able chairman [Mr. ROONEY] and members of the subcommittee are to be congratulated on the manner in which they have handled the appropriation request of the

USIA. While the sum granted is \$25 million less than the amount requested by the agency it nevertheless is a considerable increase and provides funds for the agency to carry on the classics of democracy program and to increase its overall work in several critical areas of the world. Some of us believed the full amount requested should have been granted because of the many new and difficult duties which have fallen upon USIA as a consequence of the latest Russian propaganda offensive. Nevertheless, the chairman and members of the subcommittee have done a great and patriotic job and deserve the gratitude of the Nation.

It is next to impossible to speculate with accuracy as to what the Russians might do next in their drive to conquer the world. In the past they have not hesitated to engage in armed aggression to accomplish their objectives. They have long depended upon internal subversion to aid them in destroying the independent action of nations and men. They have demonstrated a capacity to stop at nothing in their fanatical drive to eliminate competition of every sort in the countries occupied by communism.

#### HOW SOVIET SPREADS DOCTRINE

We also know that the Communists have made tremendous gains in deceiving large numbers of people in many lands as to the true facts about communism in practice. One of their principal weapons to misguide public opinion has always been books carrying the theories and doctrines of communism.

In every country of the world the Russians have put out inexpensive books in the native language in order to get their propaganda story across. By inexpensive books I mean books within the easy reach of students, laboring people and youth. In instances where important groups are made a special target of the Communists thousands of doctrinal books are spread among them at no monetary cost to the victim whatever. In the case of colleges, universities, and outstanding intellectuals the Communists have deluxe, leatherbound editions of the basic works of Marx, Lenin, Engels, and so forth, which are presented as gifts. All in all they make certain that anyone who can read will not find it difficult to come by one of their doctrinal books.

Moreover the Communists have developed the know-how for distributing great volumes of their books. For example, in India the Communists have a virtual monopoly of the inexpensive book market. This accounts in large measure for the confusion among the people of India on the true nature of communism and their so-called neutralism on the question of communism. A captive audience in any country cannot make fair judgments on world issues when they only get one side of the issue. That is one of the major problems of the Indian people.

#### TWENTY MILLION TRANSLATIONS

The increase in budget granted the USIA will permit the Agency to carry through with its book program planned to counteract the damage done by Com-

munist books and to present the truth about the United States, including our political and social institutions. The Agency has planned to make available over 20 million books in 25 languages to the people of key countries in the free world. These will be inexpensive editions costing between 5 cents and 15 cents per copy. Thus students, laboring people and all interested will be able to get reliable books about the United States at a cost they can afford. This program will be concentrated on those areas where the Communists have flooded the bookshops, colleges, and libraries with their cheap books carrying Communist ideology.

#### BIRTH OF A PROJECT

In this connection it was my privilege and my pleasure to play a part in launching the project called Classics of Democracy. This project is now known to practically every Member of the Congress and has gained the support of important national organizations and prominent individuals in every part of the country. The Committee on Books Abroad of the USIA has given long and careful study to the project. Recently on the suggestion of the group backing the Classics of Democracy program a pilot project was launched to bring about the production of inexpensive books in some 10 different languages. A number had been recommended by our group as the type best expressing our American political and social philosophy. This project already has blazed the trail for a winning-books program and maximum utilization of the many fine suggestions which have developed from the original project and campaign for the Classics of Democracy.

I hope the USIA will not find it necessary to cut any funds from the book program. I have been assured that it will not. That program is the best weapon we have to help us win a just peace by making the political and social ideals which have made America the leading peace-loving nation of the world, known to millions of people who are hungry for knowledge and the true facts about the American people and the philosophies of democratic government by which we abide.

Again, I congratulate the subcommittee on a job well done.

#### HOW PROGRAM DEVELOPED

Mr. Chairman, I have stated that I was privileged to have a part in the Classics of Democracy program. It was a part which I shared with the distinguished statesman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]. The concept was born in, and the dynamic drive in its development came from, the discussions and activities of a small group in Chicago composed of:

Dr. Harold Fey, executive editor of the Christian Century, probably the most widely read Protestant periodical in the country.

Dr. Jerome G. Kerwin, chairman of the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation, University of Chicago. He is nationally known as an educator in the field of political science and a prominent Catholic layman.

Dr. Richard P. McKeon, professor of philosophy, University of Chicago, a State Department visitor to universities in India, and a former member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

Dr. Emery T. Filbey, vice-president emeritus of the University of Chicago.

Thomas B. Stauffer, Humanities instructor, Wilson Junior College. He has a rich background in foreign service and was at one time aid to the Honorable Jefferson Caffery.

John McGinnis, President, Pennsylvania Railroad Lodge, No. 225, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. T. Burch, executive editor, Chicago Daily News.

Van Allen Bradley, literary editor of the Chicago Daily News.

It began with informal discussions in Chicago motivated by observations made by members of the group during world travel both in an official and unofficial capacity. Their spadework brought them a letter of approval from the Committee on Books Abroad for the United States Advisory Commission on Information. Dr. Mark A. May, chairman of the committee, called upon the Chicagoans to supply a list of books to be considered.

#### OUTSTANDING JOURNALISTIC ACHIEVEMENT

In February of 1955 the Chicago Daily News called upon its foreign correspondents in different parts of the world to investigate the extent of the Communist book campaign and what the United States was doing to meet it. The reports from Paris, London, Bonn, Rome, as well as uncommitted parts of Asia and Africa all pointed to the fact that in the words of Van Allen Bradley, the literary editor of the News, "The United States is losing the Battle of the Books." In an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News and in all the Knight newspapers on June 6, 1955, Mr. Bradley pointed out:

Russia is turning out in many languages millions of volumes of inexpensive editions of the classic Communist statements of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and other writers, whereas we have nothing to compare with the Communist cheap book distribution plan.

The illuminating and revealing survey of the foreign book situation by the Chicago Daily News was one of the year's outstanding American journalistic achievements. The report will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 6, pages 7930 and 7931 of June 8, 1955.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE SHOWS APPROVAL

The public response was instant and widespread. Further evidence of the depth of the popular interest in the Classics of Democracy program was furnished by the response to the questionnaire mailed in December of 1955 to 3,500 outstanding industrialists, editors, educators and recognized leaders in labor, veteran and women's organizations to sound public reaction to the proposed program. Another purpose of the questionnaire was to ascertain what books in the judgment of a jury of American enlightened public opinion were entitled to inclusion in the list of books

Americans as a whole would agree constitute the imperishable classics of our democracy.

Many of the letters received in response to the questionnaire were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The reading of these letters, I can safely say, furnishes a liberal education in the subject. Most of my colleagues, I am sure, are familiar with them. As one colleague remarked, "Once one starts reading, he cannot stop until the last word of the last letter, they are that interesting, inspiring and patriotically thrilling." Moreover, the letters reflected the thinking of the highest scholarship of the country. If you have not read these letters, you really have missed the substance of a most enriching hour or two of reading time.

#### CONFERENCES WITH USIA CHIEFS

Meanwhile conferences had been going on with Theodore C. Streibert, the able director of USIA, Dr. Franklin L. Burdette, Edward O'Connor, Dr. Claude E. Hawley, and others of USIA in which Congressman FEIGHAN and I participated. On January 27, 1956, Director Streibert gave the glad announcement of the launching of the pilot project in the following letter:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: May I extend to you my appreciation for your leadership in highlighting the necessity for creating and distributing overseas inexpensive editions of American classics of democracy as one of the principal means for furthering United States information objectives.

In accordance with our conversation and with discussions you have held with members of the Agency staff, I should like to recapitulate certain related activities the Agency is now pursuing. Inexpensive editions of 25 United States titles in English are being prepared and will be distributed commercially in Asia beginning February 1. Of these, 10 express our basic American social and political philosophy. In February a pilot project will be undertaken to publish 10 titles in foreign languages to be made available in the most inexpensive form possible. Through this project we expect to develop the necessary channels to permit the launching of a large-scale program which will accelerate the overseas distribution of books about the United States. Several of the titles used in this project are planned to be of the type advocated in your proposals.

Looking to the future, we are requesting funds from Congress to permit expansion of the program for the distribution of inexpensive books in English to a level of 80 titles, plus some 440 editions of inexpensive translations, encompassing publication in more than 20 languages. For the most part, these will be available in foreign markets for the equivalent of 10 cents retail, although in some instances individual titles may be priced at the equivalent of 15 or 20 cents, depending upon the requirements of the program in different parts of the world. In all cases, commercial facilities will be used in order that the books may be accessible through normal means.

It is hardly necessary for me to tell you how much all of us in the Agency appreciate the interest you have shown and the work you have done. It is certainly gratifying to learn of the response you have received from hundreds of outstanding citizens and organizations throughout the country. Please extend our thanks to the group of Chicagoans who assisted in promoting the idea of worldwide distribution of the Classics of Democracy and particularly to the Chicago Daily News for its pioneering efforts. We hope they



will all continue their interest in this work and that we will have the benefit of their continuing advice.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE C. STREIBERT.

#### CONGRESSMAN HAUNTS BOOK STALLS

It would be impossible to overstate the importance of Congressman FEIGHAN's trip to the Orient after the adjournment of the first session for first-hand information. For days and weeks he haunted the book stalls. Perhaps no American with the single exception of Dr. Richard P. McKeon ever before made such a thorough inspection of what people in the Orient at grassroots were buying and reading. The American people are greatly indebted to Congressman FEIGHAN for the weeks of grinding, fatiguing work he gave to this work. What he found verified in every detail the reports from the foreign correspondents of the Chicago Daily News that we were losing the battle for the minds and hearts of men because the classics of our political philosophy, the classics that inspired our own forefathers, just were not available in translated and inexpensive editions.

On December 9, 1955, Congressman FEIGHAN reported to the Advisory Committee on Books Abroad on his trip to the Far East where he observed the distribution of Communist and other books through commercial channels. His report made a profound impression.

On February 21, 1956, I reported to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations chaired by Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY on the findings of the Chicago group and the results of the nationwide questionnaire among leaders in American public opinion. The testimony will be found on pages 377 to 383 of the public hearings on USIA. I am deeply grateful to Chairman ROONEY and the members of the subcommittee for the lengthy and sympathetic hearing they accorded the presentment of the views of the Chicago group and the larger group nationwide that had responded to the questionnaire. I wish to take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of all those interested in the Classics of Democracy program to Chairman ROONEY and Congressmen PRINCE H. PRESTON, ROBERT L. F. SIKES, DON MAGNUSON, FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., FRANK T. BOW, and CLIFF CLEVENGER.

#### ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BOOKS

In February of 1956 the Advisory Committee on Books Abroad of the United States Advisory Commission on Information gave a much appreciated and significant recognition by devoting one of its sessions to a discussion of the project. Congressman FEIGHAN and I were honored by an invitation to appear before this most distinguished body. We were accompanied by Mr. Stauffer, representing and presenting the views of the Chicago group.

The United States Advisory Commission on Information was created by Public Law 402 of the 80th Congress. The members of this Commission serve without pay and represent a cross section of professional and business experience in the communications field. The chairman of the commission is Dr. Mark A. May, director of the Institute

of Human Relations of Yale University. Other members of the commission are Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, Sigurd S. Larmon, president of the advertising firm of Young & Rubican, Inc., and Philip D. Reed, chairman of General Electric Co. Assisting the commission in formulating policies there are advisory committees, each chairmanned by a member of the commission.

Dr. May is the chairman of the Advisory Committee on Books Abroad. Its members are George P. Brett, Jr., president of the Macmillan Co., Robert L. Crowell, president of Thomas Y. Crowell Co., Robert B. Downs, director of libraries at the University of Illinois, Charles W. Ferguson, Sr., editor of the Readers Digest, Freeman Lewis, executive vice president of Pocket Books, Inc., Keyes D. Metcalf, former director of libraries at Harvard University, and Charles E. Odegaard, dean of the Colleges of Literature, Science, and the Arts of the University of Michigan.

#### COMMISSION RECOMMENDS PROJECT

In its 11th semiannual report to Congress, made on March 30, 1956, the Commission approved the recommendation of its advisory committee that "in view of the present world situation resulting from the Geneva 'summit' meeting it is imperative that large quantities of books be translated and widely distributed in certain areas." The Commission stated:

In view of these facts we agree with the Advisory Committee on Books Abroad that it is in the public interest for the Congress of the United States to increase its appropriations for the translation and distribution abroad of selected American books at prices which will compete with those of subsidized Communist books.

In recent months, a group of citizens in Chicago has expressed interest in the translation and distribution abroad in low-priced editions of the Classics of Democracy. We agree thoroughly that a substantial number of the books to be included in the Agency's program of low-cost translations should be of this nature. Some should be complete volumes in original form, others could be collections of basic documents, assembled and described by eminent scholars.

We are glad to note that Congressmen BARRATT O'HARA, of Chicago, and MICHAEL FEIGHAN from Cleveland have been working with this group of citizens on this matter and are taking an active interest in the need for a greater distribution abroad of American books and particularly translations of the Classics of Democracy.

#### VICTORY NOW IN SIGHT

Mr. Chairman, we now are on our way to victory in the war for the hearts and minds of men. That is why, as I have said, this is a day of historical significance. Again I commend and congratulate the distinguished chairman and all the members of a great and far-visioned subcommittee.

In closing, permit me to cite one recent illustration of how all the world is hungering for the classics of our democracy that heretofore for the most part have been unavailable in translated editions. At long last an edition of the Federalist Papers in Italian has been placed before the people of Italy. The University of Rome recently undertook the translation and publication. The volume is more

pretentious than the 10- and 15-cent editions to which I have referred. It is selling for \$2.60 per copy. Already it is second on the list of best sellers in Italy.

What, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, may we expect to come to our country and to the cause of democracy as dividends on what we are doing today when all over the world are classics of democracy, translated into all tongues and selling for 10 and 15 cents a volume, within the reach of everybody?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

#### THE IRISH REVOLUTION

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, today we pay our tribute to those men of Ireland, who 40 years ago on April 24, 1916, first proclaimed publicly the existence of the Republic of Ireland and through armed revolution attempted to throw off the yoke of British usurpation. Through divided authority and the lack of a single command the long and carefully planned revolution failed to achieve the complete success and military victory which it sought. Nevertheless it did produce the declaration of independence for all of Ireland and prepared the way for the ultimate creation of the present Republic of Ireland, whose Government so ably and efficiently directs the affairs of the people residing in that part of Ireland, which is entrusted to its present care and jurisdiction.

Throughout the entire period of British domination the Irish people carried on an unceasing struggle to win ultimately their full freedom and independence. No nation has ever been called upon to wage so long and tireless a battle to regain one by one the inherent rights of freemen and even the inalienable rights of human beings, which had been so callously denied by the British and so grudgingly conceded through the centuries. The discolored pages of history relating the abuses of British rule in Ireland cannot be repainted even by the oratory of a Churchill or his voluminous writings on British historical achievements. No nation has suffered more or endured greater outrages than have the Irish people. All the crimes being committed today against the rights and freedoms of peoples scattered throughout this troubled world, had their foreshadowing on the soil of Ireland and in the homes of Irish people.

Although the uprising in the city of Dublin was short lived and its success doomed by the early arrival of British reinforcements, nevertheless the Irish revolutionaries conducted themselves with honor and waged their warfare in strict accordance with military codes. This revolt against the British army of occupation in Ireland might have ended in the most dismal failure, since it was limited to the confines of the city of Dublin almost exclusively. The confusion in orders and the delay of a day in starting the revolt occasioned a failure of similar insurrections, which had been planned, in other parts of the nation.

Failure, however, was not to be the historical estimate of the Easter Rising in Ireland. The vicious retaliation of the British commanding officer, Gen. Sir John Maxwell, made certain that all who gave their lives in the cause of Irish freedom were true martyrs for the sake of liberty. On April 25, three prominent citizens of Dublin, who played no part in the warfare, were arrested and on the following morning shot in the Portobello Barracks and secretly buried, under orders of Captain Bowen-Colthurst, the British officer in charge. With non-combatants treated in this manner, it was not surprising that all leaders in the revolt should expect a like fate. Thus all signers of the Independence Proclamation were speedily tried and shot, as well as most of the military leaders of the Irish forces.

The public reaction in Ireland was instantaneous. On May 3, three of the signatories of the proclamation, Clarke, MacDonagh, and Pearse, were shot following a secret field court-martial. The next 5 days were marked with the announcement of like shootings, until the clamor in Ireland was echoed in America and reechoed throughout the British Colonies. Even the Manchester Guardian cried out that the executions were becoming an atrocity.

George Bernard Shaw wrote in protest:

My own view is that the men who were shot in cold blood, after their capture or surrender, were prisoners of war, and that it was, therefore, entirely incorrect to slaughter them. The relation of Ireland to Dublin Castle is, in this respect, precisely that of the Balkan States to Turkey, of Belgium or the city of Lille to the Kaiser, and of the United States to Great Britain.

Until Dublin Castle is superseded by a National Parliament and Ireland voluntarily incorporated with the British Empire, as Canada, Australasia, and South Africa have been incorporated, an Irishman resorting to arms to achieve the independence of his country is doing only what Englishmen will do, if it be their misfortune to be invaded and conquered by the Germans in the course of the present war. Further, such an Irishman is as much in order morally in accepting assistance from the Germans, in her struggle with England, as England is in accepting the assistance of Russia in her struggle with Germany. The fact that he knows that his enemies will not respect his rights if they catch him, and that he must, therefore, fight with a rope around his neck, increases his risk, but adds in the same measure to his glory in the eyes of his compatriots and of the disinterested admirers of patriotism through the world. It is absolutely impossible to slaughter a man in this position without making him a martyr and a hero, even though the day before the rising he may have been only a minor poet. The shot Irishmen will now take their places beside Emmett and the Manchester martyrs in Ireland, and beside the heroes of Poland and Serbia and Belgium in Europe; and nothing in heaven or earth can prevent it. . . .

I remain an Irishman, and am bound to contradict any implication that I can regard as a traitor any Irishman taken in a fight for Irish independence against the British Government, which was a fair fight in everything except the enormous odds my countrymen had to face.

The reaction in America was expressed in the New York World, which declared:

The hurried vengeance of the military authorities, for which the Government is responsible, has written a chapter that will forever stand to Great Britain's credit.

The celebrated poet, Joyce Kilmer, organized a mammoth memorial service in Central Park, New York, for those who died for Ireland in the rising.

At the very time President Wilson was enunciating his principles of international justice, so applicable to Ireland, which declared our belief in these fundamental things:

First, that every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live. . . . Second, that the small states of the world have a right to enjoy the same respect for their sovereignty and for their territorial integrity that great and powerful nations expect and insist upon.

English statesmen realized that their hope of bringing America into the war was now a forlorn one. The British Ambassador in Washington wrote:

I do not think we can count on American sympathy . . . the attitude towards England has been changed for the worse by recent events in Ireland. . . . If we are able to settle the Home Rule question at once, the announcement will have a beneficial effect here, although I do not think that anything we can do would conciliate the Irish here.

Fearing the outcome of the future elections in the United States an effort was made to get something done provisionally to settle the Irish Home Rule question and thereby appease American feelings. So Lloyd George inaugurated the nefarious conferences in which Home Rule was proposed but also in which partition was presented. The Home Rule Act of 1914 was to apply only to 26 counties, but the 6 counties in the Northeast were to be left out. Moreover Lloyd George wrote to Sir Edward Carson:

My DEAR CARSON: I enclose Greer's draft propositions. We must make it clear that at the end of the provisional period Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland.

This secret letter was accepted by Carson as "a precious possession, guaranteeing me that the six counties would be left out, and that they never could be put back again without an act of Parliament." This behind-the-scenes written guaranty made acceptance of partition palatable to the pro-British Unionists in the northeast; and the temporary nature of the partition made this poisonous proposal potable for the freedom-seeking people of the rest of Ireland. Yet 40 years after, the temporary partition remains, and today the English statesmen attempt to assert that it remains a question to be settled between the two divisions of Ireland, and that the London Parliament has nothing to do with it. This criminal expedient was engineered by the English, enacted by their Parliament and should be righted today by that same Parliament without further ado.

It is often said that the evil that men do lives after them. So it is with the creators of partition in Ireland. The evils of the situation remain. The evils of that example are copied in various countries throughout the world, and are in a large measure the cause of world unrest today. It is late in the day to remedy the evil that has been done, but that the glory of the Irish martyrs of Easter week may not be dimmed, I pray that the days of partition are numbered and that a unified Ireland may arise to take her rightful place among the nations of the world. Then the Irish declaration of independence, issued on that fateful Easter Monday, 40 years ago, may take its place among the cherished documents of the world, in which the peoples of the different nations have expressed their demand for freedom.

That the text of the Irish declaration may be known to you and be cherished as a sacred document, I desire to read its text at this time:

*The Provisional Government of the Irish Republic to the People of Ireland:*

Irishmen and Irishwomen, in the name of God and of the dead generations from which she receives her old tradition of nationhood, Ireland, through us, summons her children to her flag and strikes for her freedom.

Having organized and trained her manhood through her secret revolutionary organization, the Irish republican brotherhood, and through her open military organizations, the Irish Volunteers and the Irish Citizen Army; having patiently perfected her discipline; having resolutely waited for the right moment to reveal itself, she now seizes that moment and, supported by her exiled children in America and by gallant allies in Europe, but relying in the first on her own strength, she strikes in full confidence of victory.

We declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, to be sovereign and indefeasible. The long usurpation of that right by a foreign people and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished except by the destruction of the Irish people. In every generation the Irish people have asserted their right to national freedom and sovereignty; 6 times during the past 300 years they have asserted it in arms. Standing on that fundamental right and again asserting it in arms in the face of the world, we hereby proclaim the Irish Republic as a sovereign independent state, and we pledge our lives and the lives of our comrades in arms to the cause of freedom, of its welfare, and of its exaltation among the nations.

The Irish Republic is entitled to, and hereby claims, the allegiance of every Irishman and Irishwoman. The Republic guarantees religious and civil liberty, equal rights, and equal opportunities to all its citizens, and declares its resolve to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and of all its parts, cherishing all the children of the nation equally, and oblivious of the differences, carefully fostered by an alien government, which have divided a minority from the majority in the past.

Until our arms have brought the opportune moment for the establishment of a permanent national government, representative of the whole people of Ireland, and elected by the suffrages of all her men and women, the provisional government, hereby constituted, will administer the civil and military affairs of the Republic in trust for the people. We place the cause of the Irish Republic under the protection of the Most



High God, whose blessing we invoke upon our arms, and we pray that no one who serves that cause will dishonor it by cowardice, inhumanity, or rapine. In this supreme hour the Irish nation must, by its valor and discipline, and by the readiness of her children to sacrifice themselves for the common good, prove itself worthy of the august destiny to which it is called.

Signed on behalf of the provisional government:

THOMAS J. CLARKE.  
SEAN MACDIARMADA.  
P. H. PEARSE.  
JAMES CONNOLLY.  
THOMAS MACDONAGH.  
EAMONN CEANNT.  
JOSEPH PLUNKETT.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for graciously yielding me this time. The gentleman from New York and his committee have done a wonderful job on this appropriation bill as they have done on appropriation bills over the years. It does remain, however, that a very important appropriation has been omitted from this legislation, and, therefore, I am planning to offer an amendment to restore at least a portion of this appropriation which was denied by the committee.

I plan to offer an amendment to restore a portion of the funds for new construction for the Federal Bureau of Prisons. I do not claim to be an authority on this subject, but I have taken an active interest in our prison setup and have recently had an occasion to make a detailed study during a tour of one of the Federal institutions. Therefore, I feel I am somewhat familiar with their problems. I, for one, am proud of the prison system in the United States. I am not proud of the fact that it is necessary to have prisons, but I am extremely proud of the prisons we have since it is necessary to have them.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the hearings held by this committee clearly show the critical situation existing in Federal types of prisons in our country. And if this appropriation is not accepted, I can foresee a general deterioration of our complete system. I hope my amendment is accepted by this Congress as our prisons are overcrowded today, and it will take 3 additional years to construct a new prison. There will be 3,400 more prisoners at that time than we have today. We have enough hardened criminals today committed to other institutions and overcrowding their normal capacity to completely fill this new-type prison if it were available today.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment because I believe my country has the best prison system in the world, and I want to keep it that way. I have the utmost confidence in Mr. James Bennett, the director of the prison system, as I feel he has held the system on a high level and has done a job comparable with that done by the FBI. Both Mr. Bennett and Mr. Hoover are career men dedicated to their service and their country. I respect their judgment and know, as you know, that their decisions

are far beyond the realm of political or bureaucratic influence.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time, I shall offer an amendment to increase the appropriation by \$9,500,000 for the purpose of constructing a maximum security type prison. I have no information as to where this prison will be located, but I feel that this is not the question to be determined. The decision must be made coldly and realistically on the basis of need or justification for such a prison and if it is approved an appropriate site could be selected at a later date.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I feel very much as does the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]. I take this time simply to congratulate the committee on what I think was a very wise decision in the reasonable increase it provided in funds for the work of the United States Information Agency. This Agency represents us in the most crucial struggle of our time, a struggle which transcends party lines.

In every far corner of the earth, in the ancient Middle Eastern desert, in the teeming, smoldering cities of the Orient, in the war-smitten villages of southern Europe, men and women are choosing sides between two diametrically opposed ways of life. How they choose may well determine the fate of our children.

Our competitor in this struggle for men's minds is making a supreme effort to capture the imagination and the allegiance of the world's peoples.

By the most conservative estimate, Russia has been spending more than \$3 billion every year on propaganda aimed at depicting this Nation of ours as a land presided over by warmongers and Wall Street imperialists who exploit the great majority of our people. To combat this monstrous falsehood, the United States Information Agency has had only a minute fraction of this amount with which to spread abroad the truth about American democracy and matters of American policy.

Thomas Jefferson said that truth is the sufficient adversary of falsehood. But that truth must be told. It must be told often and convincingly.

Our Nation has the most dynamic, the most appealing, and the most practical political idea ever conceived by the mind of man, and we have throughout the world a vast yawning market simply crying for this product which we alone as a nation can supply. With all of our inventive genius as advertisers and as exponents of the written and spoken word, with our uncanny ability to make the taste buds cry out for Lucky Strikes and Coca-Cola, it seems nothing short of suicide to allow ourselves to lose this competition of ideas by default. And this is the only way we could lose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. I thank my distinguished friend, Chairman ROONEY, and wish to

commend the members of the committee for the excellent work accomplished on this important appropriation bill. I certainly do not wish to be expressing negative thoughts upon the constructive work which the committee has done, but our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and also the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON], have spoken of the Department of State as being our first line of defense, adopting wide and broad policies and winning the cold war.

I have been concerned and alarmed, Mr. Chairman, regarding the resolution adopted by the Parliament of Iceland to expel from that little island, our American forces. This expulsion resolution was adopted by the Icelandic Parliament by a vote of 31 to 16.

Certainly this expression is evidence that we are losing the cold war. It appears that our present State Department policies are not leading us in the right direction—that we are losing rather than gaining friends. We are losing our allies.

I was so concerned about this matter, Mr. Chairman—a most distressing incident—that I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State, asking for an explanation of the motivating reasons behind the adoption of this resolution. I received an extended letter from Mr. Robert C. Bell, the Assistant Secretary of State, outlining the history of our forces being in Iceland and of the action which resulted in the adoption of the resolution expelling our forces from that country.

It is certainly significant to me that we are losing our allies, we are losing our friends. This is evidenced by this resolution which has been adopted demanding that our forces be expelled from Iceland. The resolution adopted goes on to state that immediate action should be taken to effectuate the policy of the adopted resolution to the end that the American forces be removed from Iceland, and that the Icelanders take over the manning of the military installations and that the American military forces leave the country; that if agreement concerning the above is not reached the matter should be followed up by renouncing the existing defense agreement.

Mr. Chairman, I think that resolution and the decisive vote by which it was adopted is indicative of what is happening to us in several parts of the world, losing out with our neighbors and former allies. The matter is deserving of the thoughtful consideration and action of the Committees on Foreign Affairs of the House and Senate.

The letter from the Assistant Secretary of State follows:

APRIL 23, 1956.

The Honorable JOE L. EVINS,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. EVINS: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated April 13, 1956, inquiring as to what is behind the resolution adopted on March 23 by the Icelandic Parliament. The resolution (copy attached) states that Icelandic policy concerning the Icelandic-United States Defense Agreement should be revised immediately "with the aim in mind that Icelanders take over the guarding and maintenance of military installa-

tions—but not military activities—and that the defense forces leave the country."

As your letter indicates, the conduct of American troops now stationed in Iceland is not a factor motivating the passage of the resolution; there have been no incidents involving American troops for some time.

The passage of the resolution must be considered in the light of Icelandic history and of the current political situation in Iceland. Prior to World War II Iceland remained largely isolated from the current of world events. Since 1918 Iceland had been a sovereign state united with Denmark under a common king with Denmark conducting Iceland's foreign policy and foreign representation. After Denmark was occupied by German forces on April 9, 1940, communication between Iceland and King Christian was severed. In May 1940 Iceland was occupied by British forces. In July 1941, an agreement was made with the Icelandic authorities for United States forces to replace the British in Iceland. On June 17, 1944, after a plebiscite in Iceland, Iceland was formally established as a republic. The United States and Icelandic Governments agreed to terminate United States responsibility for the defense of Iceland on October 7, 1946.

In 1949 when Iceland joined NATO, Iceland stated to the United States and to NATO that it was out of the question for a foreign army or for foreign military bases to be located in Iceland in time of peace, although in case of war, allied nations might request privileges similar to those enjoyed in World War II. In 1951, in view of the Korean War and the fear of a new world war, Iceland signed an agreement with the United States permitting the stationing of United States troops in Iceland. There is, however, an understandable desire on the part of Icelanders to reduce to a minimum the presence of foreign troops there. It is probably partly in deference to this feeling and partly because some Icelandic leaders now consider the international outlook to be more favorable than it was in 1951 that the above-mentioned resolution calling for the withdrawal from Iceland of United States forces was passed by the Icelandic Parliament.

Current developments in Iceland should be viewed against the above background. The present caretaker government in Iceland, as its predecessor, is a coalition of the Conservative Party (21 seats out of 52 in Parliament) and the Progressive Party (16 seats). Opposition parties were the Social Democrat (6 seats); National Defense (2 seats); and Communist (7 seats). The Progressive Party decided to join forces with the Social Democratic Party and withdraw from its restive coalition with the Conservative Party, thus precipitating special elections in Iceland on June 24, 1956. Before Parliament was dissolved it passed the resolution of March 28, sponsored by the Progressive and Social Democrat Parties. The National Defense and Communist Parties supported it in lieu of a more drastic resolution which they had proposed. The final vote was 31 to 18 (Conservative, with 3 Conservatives absent).

No action thus far has been taken by the present caretaker government of Iceland to implement the resolution and there are no indications whether any such action will be taken prior to the June 24 elections. It is possible that, before any irrevocable decision is made by the Icelandic Government, Icelandic authorities will become aware of the serious danger which such action would cause to their own nation as well as to other members of NATO.

I believe you will find the foregoing helpful in assessing the significance of the resolution adopted by the Icelandic Parliament.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,  
Assistant Secretary  
(For the Secretary of State).

(Enclosure: Resolution.)

# ALTHING RESOLUTION ON ICELAND'S FOREIGN POLICY IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEFENSE AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES

The Althing resolves to declare:

The foreign policy of Iceland, hereafter as it has up to the present, should be aimed at protecting the independence and security of the country; friendly relations with other nations; and a joint stand of the Icelanders with their neighboring nations in security matters—such as their participation in NATO.

In view of the changed situation since the Defense Agreement was reached in 1951, and the declarations that a foreign army shall not be stationed in Iceland in time of peace, a revision of the conduct of affairs adopted in that connection should immediately be carried out with the aim in mind that the Icelanders take over the guarding and maintenance of military installations—but not military activities—and that the military forces leave the country. If agreement concerning the above is not reached, the matter shall be followed up by renouncing the Defense Agreement, in accordance with the provision for this in article VII.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

## IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE Salaries and expenses

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, including advance of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while en route; payment of allowances (at a rate not in excess of \$1 per day) to aliens, while held in custody under the immigration laws, for work performed; payment of rewards; not to exceed \$35,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and accounted for solely on his certificate; not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed 251 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to exceed 2 for replacement only) and maintenance and operation of aircraft; firearms and ammunition; refunds of head tax, maintenance bills, immigration fines, and other items properly returnable, except deposits of aliens who become public charges and deposits to secure payment of fines and passage money; operation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files and for rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; and maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies and their wives and dependent children, including return of such persons to place of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be authorized by the Attorney General; \$47,550,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of the 5 assistant commissioners and 1 district director shall be at the rate of grade GS-16: *Provided further*, That of the amount herein appropriated not to exceed \$50,000 may be used for the emergency replacement of aircraft upon certificate of the Attorney General.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: On page 22, lines 7 to 10, inclusive, strike out "*Provided*, That the compensation of the 5 assistant commissioners and

1 district director shall be at the rate of grade GS-16: *Provided further*," and insert in lieu thereof "*Provided*,".

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I feel it is incumbent upon me, in fact it is my duty, to offer this amendment which provides that the compensation of 5 assistant commissioners and 1 district director shall be at the grade of GS-16 be stricken from the bill.

This language in the bill is clearly and unquestionably legislation in an appropriation bill and is a direct usurpation of the rights and prerogatives of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Civil Service Commission. I regret that the great Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to include this provision in the bill. As the Members know, there are 3 supergrades at the present time, grades 16, 17, and 18. These supergrades were provided first by the Classification Act of 1949 which originated in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Last year our committee initiated legislation which raised the number of these 3 supergrades to 1,200 with 125 in grade 18, 375 in grade 17, and 700 in grade 16.

Now the Congress, through its Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, has the power and the authority and the duty to authorize these supergrades. After these supergrades are authorized by the Congress, it is provided that the Civil Service Commission shall then allocate the respective positions to the various departments and agencies. Now this provision which I am seeking to strike out would put these 6 men in grade 16 or at a salary of grade 16. I do not know anything about the qualifications of them. You are disrupting the orderly process and procedure in connection with the authorization and allocation of these supergrades by taking away from the Civil Service Commission and the two Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of Congress the right to have control over these supergrades in this instance. I wish the powerful Committee on Appropriations would quit stepping on the toes of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. If this practice is continued, you are going to have chaos and confusion and inequities arising among the Federal personnel. What does the committee know about the qualifications of these men and about the requirements for these different positions? There are 6 men involved. I understand they are very fine gentlemen, but why not go through the regular legislative procedure and let the Civil Service Commission allocate these positions to these 6 men provided their positions can qualify for grade 16? If they are entitled to grade 16, then I am sure the Civil Service Commission will put them in there. At the present time there are 71 supergrades still that have not been filled by the Civil Service Commission, and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has reported out a bill to the House just recently which authorizes 236 more supergrades.

This bill is now on the calendar of the House for action.



Let us not have confusion about these super grades. The members of the Appropriations Committee are not the ones to pass on the qualifications of each individual as to whether he should be in grade 16 or grade 17 or grade 18. These are super grades that need experts like the three members of the Civil Service Commission to pass upon the requirements and qualifications for the position in each one of these grades. I hope that the Committee on Appropriations will agree to my amendment. You are establishing here a dangerous precedent by taking away the authority and prerogatives of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Civil Service Commission to authorize and allocate these particular grades if you do not adopt my amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If this provision goes through, it will mean that the Committee on Appropriations has put through 17 super grades in 2 bills within a matter of less than 2 months; is that not true?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct. I appeal to the committee to support this amendment. It is sound. It is in the interest of good, orderly, efficient Government. How can the Committee on Appropriations, without any investigation or study, put employees and officials in grade 16, 17, or 18? I say we are treading upon dangerous ground, and I hope you will leave this matter of super grades to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Civil Service Commission. This provision which I am seeking to eliminate will be bad for employee morale and will disrupt the orderly and proper alignment of top-level positions in these super grades. It is preferential legislation for the benefit of a few specific individuals. The report of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill is strangely silent on the explanation or justification for the provision placing the five Assistant Commissioners and one District Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in grade 16. This is another effort to legislate salaries for specific positions in the executive branch which unquestionably should be left to the usual procedures and processes which are provided by Congress in the Classification Act. The Congress, through its Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the Senate and the House, should be responsible for reviewing the need for and the use of top-level positions on an overall governmentwide basis.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I realize this item does not seem to be of great importance to the Members as compared to some of the other portions of this legislation, but it is extremely important because of the principle involved.

The question before this committee now is, do you want to sustain the legislative committee of this House, or do

you want to circumvent the legislative committee of this House, and, do you also want to circumvent the Civil Service Commission of these United States? That is really the question involved here. Our committee only recently approved a bill, which is now on the calendar that provides for some 236 supergrades that would be allocated by the Civil Service Commission in their regular order for people qualified under Civil Service in the regular way of doing business, but if you are going to follow this procedure and let certain people in these agencies go to the Committee on Appropriations and get that committee to allocate grades for certain individuals, then to that extent you just weaken your legislative committee of the House. This is a more important matter than most of the Members realize. I hope that they will see fit to support the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]. It is important that they do that. I find no fault at all to the qualifications of these individuals who are being taken care of here. I am sure they are good men. That is not the point.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is acquainted with Mr. Shaughnessy, the district director in New York, is he not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, Mr. Shaughnessy is a great man; he is a distinguished public servant; certainly he is. But I do not go along with the method of handling this matter in this fashion, because there is not a word that I know of, not a line of testimony in the hearings in support of this portion of the bill—nothing at all. You agree with me on that.

If the House is going to support legislation on which there have been no hearings, on which there has been no testimony before the committee, I do not think it is right. I do not believe there is a member of this committee, aside from the chairman, who has talked to these people involved in this legislation at all about wanting these super grades. I doubt it. I doubt whether any one of heads of the agency has even called the Civil Service Commission to find out whether these people were even considered by the Commission. If they have, I wish they would tell us about it right here on the floor of the House. I should like to have your further explanation. I know they are all good men; of course they are. They are employed in the Government. They are career men. Some of them have been in the Government for years. But here you go out and pick out 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 men. You did it in this case and your committee did it a few weeks ago in another bill from another subcommittee. If that is the way these things are going to be handled, and the House wants to approve that method of handling them, then we should know it. I feel the Members here should know the situation so that they would understand what they are doing if they do not support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee

[Mr. MURRAY]. There is no question that the amendment should be approved.

This is not a matter of personalities. The gentlemen affected by this proposed legislation, surely, understand that. There is, however, a matter of policy and principle involved.

If it is to be the policy of this House to approve the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House to permit legislation to be included in such manner that it is not subject to a point of order, we should know it. If the Appropriations Committee wants to increase salaries for certain employees without following regular procedure, and without hearings of any kind, we should know it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I should like to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. Does not the provision in the bill to which the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] was offered create new grades by increasing the salaries of those who are in those positions now? Is not that what it does?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, the issue is a great deal broader than appears on the surface. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] who is the ranking minority Member was right when he suggested that the Committee on Appropriations is continuing as it has started on this line of permitting someone who is already in the Government service getting a provision in an appropriation bill raising his grade by increasing his compensation. If that is the case, what is the use of having one committee of which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] is chairman? What good then is the gentleman's committee on this phase of our business, I ask the gentleman from Tennessee? What is the use of being around when Appropriations writes legislation which should be written by Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I would say that we would soon be out of business if this method were followed. I will say to the gentleman that the amendment which I have offered, if it is approved, would save an increase of \$1,290 for each one of these 6 positions. In other words, the Committee on Appropriations, without any justification that I can see, is increasing the compensation of these 6 jobs by \$1,290 per year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Appropriations by its action put them in another grade, did they not? After the legislative committee having jurisdiction had refused to do so?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct. That is how the increase in salary comes about.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then why do we need the gentleman's committee? What does his committee do? What business do they have to transact if the Committee on Appropriations is encouraged to bring in this sort of legislation and get it approved?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will say that the committee

of which I have the honor to be chairman has spent many days and long hours setting up these supergrades and outlining the qualifications for them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And how much time has the Committee on Appropriations spent on the subject before it overruled the gentleman's committee?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I can find nothing in the hearings about that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the point. It is just as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] said, and as was stated earlier in the debate today. There is no need for a legislative committee if the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Rules can come in and jockey through this kind of a provision in an appropriation bill. Is not that right?

If we are to have legislative committees, why is it we do not just vote down one of these bills and let the beneficiaries seeking a higher grade, more pay, go back in the regular way to the proper committee? It is the only remedy, as I see the situation. As was said earlier in the day, if we do not want the legislative committees to function, if the Appropriations Committee is to be a sort of city of refuge to which every fellow who thinks he finds himself in a situation where he wants something he cannot get through the action of the proper legislative committee can run to and get what he wants, from Appropriations, let the legislative committee just disband, and we can all go campaigning. The issue is a matter of legislative procedure, of adherence to long-established customs, and this new procedure is not fair to the legislative committees. It is not sound legislative procedure.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I have heard the argument made that we ought to approve this irregular procedure because Mr. Shaughnessy is a nice man.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who is he?

Mr. MEADER. Does that establish a precedent so that all nice men in the Government ought to go to the Appropriations Committee and get their salaries raised?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If this amendment is rejected and if that action is hereafter considered a precedent, that is just what it does do. I too think I am a nice man, and I think if I could go to the Appropriations Committee and get the salaries of Congressmen and all Federal employees reduced, while I might not be popular, we might slow down this threatened inflation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I must disagree with my two delightful friends, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. They surely have been persistent about this little thing which would cost the taxpayers in the neighborhood of \$3,600. They were advised beforehand by me by telephone that the

committee had unanimously agreed to take this action and insert this language in the bill because it originated in the mind of whom? In the mind of the Commissioner of Immigration, General Swing. The language was handed to the subcommittee and inserted in the bill.

On yesterday when a rule was sought both these distinguished gentlemen appeared before the Rules Committee in writing in the morning and in person in the afternoon, and opposed the granting of the rule. The rule was then granted by the Rules Committee. They opposed the adoption of the rule earlier today, and the rule was adopted by the House. Now they have their third bite at the cherry.

I want to point out first that this language which I shall read is presently the law because it was in this same appropriation bill at this time a year ago, the 1956 supply bill for the Department of Justice. It is the law of the land today. The gentleman from Tennessee well knows that this does not apply to any six employees, although six are mentioned in this language, because without any objection on the part of either of these gentlemen a year ago there was included in the bill this language:

That the compensation of the five assistant commissioners shall be at the rate of grade GS-16 as long as the positions are filled by the present incumbents.

So that a year ago the scale of GS-16 was set up for five assistant commissioners of immigration and naturalization.

Some six weeks ago the Congress saw fit to pass and the President to sign a bill permitting retired Generals Howard and Partridge to become assistant commissioners of immigration. Is it not common sense that they should be at the same level as the other assistant commissioners, making five at grade GS-16?

With regard to Mr. Shaughnessy, as was pointed out earlier by the distinguished majority leader, he was previously an assistant commissioner of immigration himself and went to New York to take the district directorship because it is one of the most important jobs in the Immigration Service.

The committee has been fair about this thing. The new language is set forth in the report. The whole business amounts to something in the neighborhood of \$3,600—a \$1,000 in the case of Mr. Shaughnessy and about \$1,290 each in the other two cases.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, it is not a question of how many dollars will be saved or spent. The question is do you think now, just between you and me and leaving the rest of them out of it—do you think this kind of procedure is fair to the other legislative committees?

Mr. ROONEY. I think so.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right, then.

Mr. ROONEY. I think they were given notice. I think it is the right thing to do under these circumstances because these men might not get GS 16 for the next 9 months or even years. Now is the time to do something which should be done. This is approved by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, General Swing, and supported by the entire committee and approved by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. About a month ago, we had these two bills here pertaining to Brigadier Generals Howard and Partridge. When the bill was debated on the floor of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] in their arguments on behalf of these bills made much of the fact that General Partridge's retired salary was \$9,688 and his salary in the civilian position would be \$11,610 and the retired salary of General Howard was \$8,875 and the salary in the civilian position that he was to occupy would be \$11,610. They indicated that to employ General Partridge on a full-time basis would cost the Government only \$1,922 a year and that to employ General Howard would cost only \$2,907. Now, just after understanding what was given to us, it is proposed to increase the salaries of these two retired generals by another \$1,290.

Mr. ROONEY. I cannot find fault with that statement. That is exactly what you would be doing. That is exactly what the committee is in agreement on. That is exactly the reason the Committee on Rules gave us the rule waiving points of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will not impose overlong on the time of the Members. Perhaps, I should have been content having asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] whether he thought this was fair or not—perhaps, I should have been content with his answer. But, then, on going to the back of the Chamber my ever-alert colleague from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] called by attention to something.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I tried to be fair. The gentleman can recall when I was but one of a few around here who supported him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was not saying that you were not fair. I do not recall the support, but assume the gentleman is correct as to that and am grateful. I am trying to accept your judgment, but my natural contrariness prevents. As I was saying, I went to the back part of the Chamber and my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan



[Mr. BENTLEY], who is always on the job, aware of what is doing, called my attention to another paragraph in this bill.

I am wondering now just how far the Committee on Appropriations wants to go in attempting to legislate and to determine policy.

As was stated before, action on this amendment is not an issue of how many dollars will be saved or how many will be wasted. The issue is as to legislative procedure. Listen to this language and read it yourself because it seems almost unbelievable to me that Appropriations should go out of its way to fix foreign policy without authorization from Foreign Affairs Committee. On page 16, line 16, section 110, reads:

It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

What has that to do with appropriations? How many dollars does that language provide for anyone or any agency to spend?

Mr. ROONEY. What is wrong with that?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What business is it of those on the Committee on Appropriations to say who should be admitted to the United Nations?

Mr. ROONEY. What is wrong with that language? Surely the gentleman does not want Red China in the United Nations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now wait a minute. Let me talk—no, of course, I do not want Red China in the United Nations. I do not want any part of the United Nations at all, if you want to discuss that point. The Congress can and should vote legislation for the United States of America. U. N. has no legal right to write laws casting burdens imposing obligations on citizens of the United States of America. I do not want any part of U. N. or any other one world organization. But what law, or rule, or policy gives the Committee on Appropriations authority to advise the House on foreign policy? How do they get over into the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and tread on their toes? Does Appropriations want Foreign Affairs abolished or its authority just reduced?

I see our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] here as usual. The first thing Veterans Administration knows this Committee on Appropriations will be legislating for your veterans. Then you will hear some squawks—pardon me, not squawks but then you will hear some ladylike language that will really burn your ears and the back of your neck, down your back to your waistline, and it will be effective.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this language to which he referred on page 16 was put in this bill some years ago as the result of an amendment being offered on the floor of the House during the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not care how it got in there. The point is that Appropriations has been invading the jurisdiction of 2 or 3 other legislative committees and now it is after the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Civil Service and Post Office, which are by this provision directly overruled.

Mr. GROSS. And on page 16 there is another provision which says that "rates may be fixed without regard to any provision of law in limitation."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The argument I am trying to make is to prove the point that the Committee on Appropriations is stepping over by or through one provision or another into the jurisdiction of other legislative committees. If the House wants to go across the board, let us do it not by invading one committee, then another. Just abolish the legislative committees and let it go at that. The legislative job is just too big for Appropriations or any other single committee; but if that be the decision of the House, let us do it by one clean, bold beheading, not piece by piece—degrading, humiliating, first one committee, then one by one all others.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is not correct, because there was inserted in this bill on a roll-call vote the language which I pointed out at page 16. The gentleman sat here this afternoon and heard the Clerk read the bill for amendment. No one objected to the language, and it is now in the bill.

With regard to this great matter that concerns just three people and about \$3,600 of the taxpayers' money, I venture to say that you have used ten or twelve thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money in opposing it this afternoon. The time has come to have a vote. The committee is willing to abide by the judgment of the Members of the House. I ask for a vote Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 79, noes 58.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 90, noes 78.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### *Buildings and facilities*

For constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account, \$1,425,000: *Provided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Illinois:

On page 23, line 16, after the word "facilities", strike out "existing" and insert in lieu thereof the word "for."

And in line 18, strike out "\$1,425,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,925,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to correct an injustice being done to the Bureau of Prisons. My amendment is to provide for the construction of a maximum-custody institution to relieve the present strain on our prison system.

Mr. Bennett, the Director of Prisons, has said the situation existing at these institutions is critical. There are only 4 maximum-security type prisons in the country. These are Alcatraz, Atlanta, Leavenworth, and McNeil Island.

On page 314 of the hearings a statement as of the end of fiscal year 1955 shows that we had approximately 1,700 prisoners over capacity in these institutions. Atlanta exceeds its capacity by 500; Leavenworth by 600. These figures change from day to day varying by institutions. But the totals remain approximately the same. It is impossible for the prisons to handle any additional prisoners at any of the maximum-security type prisons.

Mr. Chairman, never in the history of the Federal Prison System have we ever had a riot or major disturbance. This can only be maintained by adequate facilities. We have had riots and disturbances in other types of jails and prisons throughout the various States, but we have never had a riot at a Federal institution. I hope that the Members will recognize the urgent need for this institution and vote for this amendment so that we can maintain the good record which has been maintained by our Bureau of Prisons. Construction should be started now when there are no riots to cope with. It should be done in an orderly fashion.

There are more men today coming to prison than 10 years ago, and they are staying longer. The parole rate is also down. During the past 5 years, the number of prisoners serving sentence of 5 years or more has increased 26 percent. It is conservatively estimated that the Federal prison population will reach 23,400 by 1960 an increase over the 1955 average of 3,400.

This appropriation, if approved, will provide facilities for an additional 600 prisoners. Our offenders have increased by 4,000 since the last medium-security prison was constructed. The most recent maximum-custody Federal institution was built in 1902. That was Atlanta and that is 54 years ago. Alcatraz was built 87 years ago. The Director of the Bureau of Prisons has made a detailed study of the needs and has endeavored to develop a program of orderly institutional construction.

Four years ago, Mr. Bennett first requested clearance for this project. Since that time the Department of Justice and

the Bureau of the Budget opposed this construction with the argument that this would raise Government expenditures and prevent a balanced budget.

This year, they are unable to make such an argument. This appropriation was approved by the Bureau of the Budget for a supplemental appropriation bill 1 year ago, but the Committee on Appropriations failed to include this project in the general appropriation bill. However, the Senate included money for the purpose for acquisition of a site and planning for construction of this institution. In conference, this provision was stricken.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is our responsibility to include this appropriation this year, and although I am confident it will be included by the other body, I feel that such a good argument has been made by the Bureau of Prisons that this should be included by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, this is the 25th anniversary of the Bureau of Prisons. I do not believe that we should celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Bureau of Prisons which has provided the best prison system in the world by denying this appropriation which would have the effect of throwing a bomb into the center of our prison system.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. The gentleman in his very forceful talk in support of this amendment mentioned the numerous riots which occurred in local prisons and penitentiaries and the fact that there were none in Federal penitentiaries. Is it not true that one of the principal reasons for those riots was the overcrowded conditions of local penitentiaries?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That was certainly true in Illinois and, I think, was also true in other penitentiaries where they had riots in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] insist on his point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. There is a question in my mind whether we might be usurping a legislative prerogative.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, was going to offer this very important amendment, but out of respect for my senior colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] I decided to support his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment just offered would allow the Department of Justice an appropriation of \$9½ million to build a much-needed maximum security penitentiary somewhere in the United States.

Under the 5-minute rule, I, of course, will not have time to give all of the many reasons why this amendment should be adopted today; however, the need is imperative. The request comes from President Eisenhower, the Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Prisons, and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in their request to the Appropriations

Committee. A maximum security penitentiary is needed to relieve the dangerous overcrowding of penitentiaries that house prisoners convicted of serious offenses. Maximum security penitentiaries are now located at Alcatraz, Calif., Atlanta, Ga., Leavenworth, Kans., and the main institution at McNeil Island, in Washington State. The total capacity of these institutions is 5,175. As of April 12 of this year, they were housing 6,304 prisoners, an overcrowding of 1,129 prisoners convicted of serious offenses and who cannot safely be housed in other than maximum security institutions because of their bad records. This proposed maximum security institution would help relieve this situation. In addition to the present need, the Federal courts are imposing longer sentences and increasing numbers of offenders are being committed for more serious crimes. This excess population of over 1,000 prisoners in the maximum security penitentiaries cannot be taken care of at the medium security penitentiaries.

It has been admitted by the Bureau of Prisons that some of their medium security penitentiaries throughout the United States are not at capacity. However, these institutions are definitely not suitable for housing the hardened criminal and, above all, subject him to living with some person who has been convicted of a less serious crime. The hardened criminal definitely must be separated. I am sure no one would propose that we subject some young American boy who has been convicted of stealing an automobile to living in a cell with some cold-blooded murderer such as the one who shot and killed the innocent service-station attendant last week here in Washington.

Overcrowding institutions housing the more serious type of prisoners is one of the major factors for riots and other disturbances. It is folly to wait until the need for this type institution is brought home to us by some major disturbance such as has happened in a number of institutions.

If this amendment is adopted and the money is allowed, it will take 3 years to build this proposed prison. With the already overcrowded facilities and the increase in the number of hardened criminals, we are late in building this institution as the matter now stands.

Mr. Chairman, there has not been a maximum Federal penitentiary built since 1902. Think of that—54 years with the same crowded and outmoded facilities.

The Bureau of Prisons had requested the Appropriations Committee for \$17 million which would have allowed the maximum security penitentiary, plus \$7½ million for a close custody reformatory for youthful offenders. This institution is also very badly needed; however, as a compromise we have only offered an amendment for the maximum security penitentiary because I believe of the two it is the more important.

I want to be perfectly frank and honest with the Committee in saying that if this appropriation is allowed, I propose to try to have the penitentiary built somewhere in my congressional district of southern Illinois, which is near the center of population. However, I want

further to be frank with the Committee and say that a committee will be appointed to select the best location that can be found. I only feel that we should be in the running when a selection is ready to be made.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Let me say that I am in support of the amendment. I think the gentleman would have a logical reason to suggest its being built in southern Illinois because I understand that one of the requirements is that it will be on Government-owned land.

Mr. GRAY. That is exactly right.

Mr. PRICE. And there is an ample quantity of Government-owned land available in southern Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. That is a good point and I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. We have 180,000 acres of Government-owned land in my district. In addition, we have scores of cities that are willing to put up funds to buy a site and donate it free of charge to the Government, on which to build this proposed institution.

I want to say this very, very sincerely, in closing. In the interest of security and to insure adequate facilities to house the hardened criminals and in order to prevent the mixing of these hardened criminals with those who are convicted of less serious offenses and in an effort to assist the good, deserving people of southern Illinois or some other locality, I beg of you to support the Department of Justice and vote in the affirmative on this amendment.

Let me say further in closing that we have in southern Illinois 51,000 people receiving Government surplus food. We are spending a million dollars a month for public-aid assistance. This is only a \$9½ million institution. It would employ approximately 500 persons and we could pay for the institution by a saving of expenditures now being paid to relief recipients. I beg of you to support the amendment. Thank you.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman I rise in support of the amendment.

In support of this amendment I would like to say that in the last session of the Congress the Department of Justice asked for an appropriation of \$9,500,000 in a supplemental appropriation bill. Even though this request had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the Committee did not see fit to approve the amount requested.

Now, again, in this session of the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget approved \$9,500,000 for a maximum security prison, to take care of the most hardened and vicious criminals, which the committee again failed to approve.

After going into this matter with the superintendent of the Bureau of Prisons, Mr. Bennett and his assistant, Mr. Alexander, I have secured the following information:

They tell me that they are badly overcrowded in the Federal prison at Atlanta, Ga., are also overcrowded in the Federal prison at Leavenworth, Kans., and at McNeil Island, Washington State. They say that because of this overcrowding



that they have had to put major criminals in camps and other institutions which was very bad prison practice; that if funds were provided in the amount of \$9,500,000, they would expect to build a 600 man maximum security prison somewhere in the central Mississippi Valley—probably in south central Illinois, or probably in Missouri.

When I made some inquiry of the members of the subcommittee handling this matter, they raised the objection that the Department of Justice had not told them where they wanted to build the prison; that they saw no reason for appropriating before they had found a spot where they wanted to build it.

They also gave another reason that considering the prison population they were not convinced that a new prison was necessary.

In answer to the first question as to location, it is the policy of the Department of Justice to have a commission appointed, which, under the direction of the Department of Justice, will go out into the area referred to and after conferring with the officials of local cities who are interested in securing the location of the prison in their areas, and after considering what the various cities that are interested in securing the location have to offer in the way of transportation, housing, and other requirements, this committee, or commission, will decide where the prison can best be located to serve its purpose at the least expense to the Government.

This is a policy that the administration has followed before, as the Congress well knows, in locating Federal institutions, and it is a wise one in the interest of the Government.

The facts are that Mr. Bennett told me a year ago that his Department, cooperating with the Justice Department, would make no effort to decide on the location of such a prison until the Congress had showed sufficient interest in it by making a very substantial appropriation, if not the entire amount requested.

I think we can all agree that the Department's position with reference to such a location is tenable, and is just good business. We are confronted with this condition. The Department of Justice tells us that they are overcrowded by 1,100 in the major maximum security penitentiaries now, and it is possible, even though we hope crime will not increase, that by the time this prison could be constructed and readied for occupancy, we may be overcrowded by 1,500.

I do not think it is good economy to delay and put off the building of this institution because I think we must concede labor will not get cheaper, and there is little prospect that material will get cheaper. There is every prospect that if the building of this institution is delayed for another year or two, it will cost probably \$1 million or \$2 million more than it will cost if the Congress approves the appropriation in this session—so that a site could then be determined, and contracts for its construction let.

By delaying it we will lose money because the costs will go higher. By delaying it we will continue the overcrowding of present prison institutions, which is not good prison practice.

I hope the Members of the House will respect the wishes of these three executive departments to which I refer, and do the necessary thing we should do in voting for this amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. This is an appropriation bill. As I understand, this is a move to establish a new prison in the State of Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. No, not in the State of Illinois. They said when they announced it, somewhere near the center of population. The center of population does happen to be in my district.

Mr. DONDERO. Has this building ever been authorized by a legislative committee?

Mr. VURSELL. The purpose is to get this thing authorized and get it on the way now. That is why we have it here before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PRICE. If the gentleman will yield, it is authorized.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto, close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, a maximum custody institution was designed to meet in part the overcrowding at the existing maximum security penitentiaries. These maximum security penitentiaries are at Alcatraz, Calif.; Atlanta, Ga.; Leavenworth, Kans.; and the main institution at McNeil Island, Wash. The total capacity of these institutions is 5,175. As of April 12 this year, they were housing 6,304 prisoners, an overloading of 1,129 prisoners convicted of serious offenses and who cannot safely be housed in other than maximum security institutions, because of their records and the fact that approximately 25 percent of them are wanted by other jurisdictions as escapees, parole violators for other charges. Obviously the opening of a woman's section at the Terminal Island institution will not in any way relieve this dangerous overcrowding, neither will the establishment of a new youth camp or a farm dormitory at the institution at Terre Haute, Ind.

The proposed maximum security institution would help relieve this critical situation. The Federal courts are imposing longer sentences, and increasing numbers of offenders are being committed for more serious crimes. This excess population of over 1,100 prisoners in the maximum security penitentiaries can not be taken care of at the medium security penitentiaries at Lewisburg, Pa., and Terre Haute, Ind., because those institutions are already at capacity and have a limited cell capacity, most of the inmates being housed in dormitories. Nor can these dangerous security risks be housed at the minimum custody correctional institutions, which incidentally

are also overpopulated, nor at the reformatories or institutions for juveniles.

Overcrowding in institutions housing the more serious type of prisoner is one of the major factors resulting in riots and other serious disturbances. It is folly to wait until the need for this type institution is brought home to us by some major disturbances such as have happened in a number of State institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to oppose the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I agree with a good many things that have been said by the proponents of the amendment. I think a basis for compromise is very feasible here. It has been mentioned that these facilities are very badly needed and that our prisons are overcrowded. Some reference has been made that one of the four maximum security penitentiaries be located in Leavenworth, Kans. That is very true. I know the situation at Leavenworth and am very familiar with it since it is in my district. It has been mentioned that this new prison should be located in the center of population. Leavenworth would qualify on that basis. Objections have been raised on the basis that this has never been authorized. If these expanded facilities were permitted to be built at Leavenworth, no authorization would be needed. It would just be an expansion of the existing facilities. The record at Leavenworth administratively is infallible. There have been very few escapes and no riots over the past fifty-and-some-odd years. So, Mr. Chairman, I feel that this amendment should be voted down and then immediately an amendment should be offered to expand the existing facility in Leavenworth, Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that there is no decision as yet as to the definite location of this institution. There is, however, testimony before the Committee on Appropriations that this new facility is necessary. It has been recommended by the Bureau of Prisons. Authority exists under the law to construct it. We are not debating today where it should be located.

The question of location arises from the previous testimony to the effect that it would probably be built near the center of population. Statistics show that an area in Illinois is regarded as the center of population, but that does not pinpoint this institution in any particular State.

The Bureau of Prisons has indicated the proposed new prison should be near the center of population. It could be built in Iowa, Kansas, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, or any one of a number of Midwest States and still be near the center of population.

I urge approval of the amendment to provide necessary funds for the construction of the institution, the need for which has been established after thorough study. The location is to be de-

terminated by a commission. Personally, I recommend southern Illinois, where there is adequate Federal land available and which will meet all the other requirements set forth by the Bureau of Prisons.

May I emphasize the point that the Budget has approved the project. I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK]. Naturally, as I have said, I hope the new prison will be located in Illinois.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I just wanted to call to the attention of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY], the fact that at the present time they have 508 hardened criminals in Leavenworth over their normal capacity. So it is a good possibility that your constituents may have some of them for dinner one of these days.

Mr. PRICE. Yes. Location at Leavenworth would not solve the problem. There is already a Federal prison there. Neither would expansion at Leavenworth meet the need as explained to the Appropriations Committee by the Bureau of Prisons.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the committee has unanimously seen fit to delete the requested appropriation for this institution, as well as the other institution included in the budget estimate, for practically the same reasons as it did a year ago. We now find the additional facts that the prison population has gone down in the past year, and has thus proved the good judgment of the committee a year ago, and that criminal filings, according to the judiciary, have likewise fallen off in the past year.

Why anyone would want a Federal penitentiary in his district is beyond me. But there is no assurance, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, or anyone else who may like to have a prison in his district, that it will be located in southern Illinois or any definite place. I think that until such time as the Department of Justice advises the Congress as to where it proposes to locate the institution and on what terms, whether there will be donated local land without cost to the Federal taxpayers—what sort of an institution it will be in detail, that we should not approve this request.

A year ago when they estimated the present prison population they overstated it by 800 prisoners, as is shown at page 308 of the testimony in the volume entitled "Department of Justice." Mr. Bennett, at page 235 said:

We are not going to reach our population estimate of 21,400.

Mr. ROONEY. You missed it by about 800? Mr. BENNETT. Yes, sir.

Now if you will turn to the hearings at page 318 of the Department of Justice volume, wherein they show the total number of maximum-custody-type prisoners confined at the three maximum-custody institutions outside of Alcatraz, namely, Atlanta, Leavenworth, and McNeil Island, you will find there are 1,335

places for maximum-custody inmates not now being occupied by such inmates. This institution, at a cost of over \$9 million, would provide for 600 inmates, whereas you presently have 1,335 places for maximum-custody prisoners. In addition, you have the institution at Sandstone, Minn., which has a capacity, as I recall, of about 600 inmates. It is a prison presently owned by the Federal Government, and under its agreement with the State of Minnesota it could be retaken just for the asking; still we have this request for \$9 million.

I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the position taken by the chairman in opposition to the amendment.

This is a matter to which the subcommittee gave very prayerful consideration. The membership was not unmindful of the problem of prisoners. It gave this the closest consideration, and, after long deliberation, reached the conclusion that there was no necessity for an additional appropriation at this time beyond the funds providing for a new youth camp, opening of the women's section at Terminal Island, and increase of the dormitory at Terre Haute. The result is that the total new capacity has been increased in this bill.

Mr. ROONEY. So there may be no misunderstanding of that let me repeat that in the instant bill are provisions, as the gentleman has stated, for a new youth camp, a new women's section at Terminal Island, and a new dormitory at Terre Haute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired, all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Mack of Illinois) there were—ayes 26, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 206. Appropriations for the current fiscal year for "Salaries and expenses, general administration," "Salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation," "Salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service," and "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons," shall be available for uniforms and allowances therefor as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1114), as amended.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 26, line 7, following the words "as amended", add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 207. None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the prosecution of any violation of section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, when the entire crop of wheat grown on a farm was used for seed, feed, or food on such farm."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, for more than a year the Secretary of Agriculture and many Members of Congress have been urging an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to ex-

empt from marketing quota penalties excess wheat that is grown solely for use as seed, feed, or food on the farm.

The other body, in response to the Secretary's request, adopted such a bill in March 1955. The House Agriculture Committee has refused to report this bill, or any House bill, on the subject. The problem is growing more acute and something must be done.

I feel that many Members have had experience with this unfair and unnecessary restriction on our farmers.

The case of Miss Elsie Mumma, of Hummelstown, Pa., has been reported in papers all over the Nation, because Miss Mumma has armed herself and defied the Federal Government to penalize her for raising 24 acres of wheat for her own use.

A monastery and an orphanage in Georgia have run afoul of the law, even though all of the wheat they grow is used for food in those institutions. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY] pointed out in House committee hearings, public institutions of the State of Pennsylvania, accustomed to growing wheat for use as flour in hospitals, sanitariums, and penal institutions, are handicapped.

Countless cases can be cited of individual farmers who for years have followed a practice of crop rotation, including wheat, using all of the grain produced for feed and seed on their own farms. A man who customarily devoted 20 acres to wheat each year, and whose allotment is cut to 14 acres, finds his rotation is thrown out of balance, he is short of feed and straw, and he cannot understand why the Federal Government should interfere with his operation so long as he never has, and never will, sell even a kernel of the wheat produced.

This is the situation that needs correction. In view of the attitude of the committee, it appears that the only possible solution is the adoption of my amendment.

When a farmer is found to be growing in excess of 15 acres of wheat, and in excess of his acreage allotment, the law imposes a penalty which can be satisfied in several ways. He can plow under the excess acreage before a stated deadline. He can harvest it and store it under bond until such time as marketing quotas no longer are in effect. He can pay a cash penalty, which varies according to the parity price of wheat. If he refuses to do any of these, the Secretary of Agriculture has no alternative under the law but to refer the case to the Department of Justice.

The constitutionality of the law was upheld in 1942 by the Supreme Court decision in the case of Wickard against Filburn.

Secretary Benson, as I have indicated, does not wish to prosecute farmers whose violation consists of growing a few acres of wheat for their own use.

Department of Agriculture officials have pointed out that this penalty on such farmers is bad publicity for the Department, for our Government, and for the agricultural program itself. In a recent case, decided in favor of the Government, the Federal judge himself referred to the "embattled farmer." It is



natural to have sympathy with a man who is minding his own business and suffering from Government interference. It is natural for a farmer to want to be king of his own quarter section and to expect freedom so long as nothing he does interferes with the rights of others.

Lest anyone think that large amounts of wheat are involved, let me point out that the most recent figures show that in 65.2 percent of the cases processed the acreage involved was less than 30 acres. In only 19.2 percent did it exceed 40 acres. This excess production, fed on the farm, is not going to throw the whole wheat program out of kilter. The restriction and the penalty, however, are a serious blow to the farmer who is trying to operate his small acreage on a self-sustaining basis.

At this point in my remarks, I wish to read the list showing the number of cases reported in 1954 and 1955, all involving excess wheat used solely for feed, food and seed on the producing farm:

**CASES IN WHICH MARKETING QUOTA PENALTIES WERE INCURRED WHERE ALL OF THE WHEAT PRODUCED ON THE FARM WAS USED SOLELY AS FOOD, FEED, OR SEED**

During the 1954 and 1955 crop years the number of cases in which marketing quota penalties were incurred, where all of the wheat produced on the farm was used solely as food, feed, or seed, is estimated by the State agricultural stabilization and conservation committee State offices to be 1,899. These cases, by States, are as follows:

State	1954	1955
New York.....	120	56
New Jersey.....	16	10
Pennsylvania.....	185	52
Ohio.....	100	69
Indiana.....	51	15
Illinois.....	28	17
Michigan.....	75	25
Wisconsin.....	9	7
Minnesota.....	2	2
Iowa.....	16	6
Missouri.....	133	108
South Dakota.....	1	0
Nebraska.....	24	16
Kansas.....	27	31
Maryland.....	7	17
Virginia.....	43	25
West Virginia.....	10	6
North Carolina.....	29	11
South Carolina.....	40	5
Georgia.....	8	3
Kentucky.....	63	26
Tennessee.....	14	3
Arkansas.....	1	3
Oklahoma.....	15	5
Texas.....	11	2
Montana.....	39	46
Idaho.....	24	19
Wyoming.....	2	7
Colorado.....	5	7
New Mexico.....	2	4
Utah.....	90	65
Washington.....	12	9
Oregon.....	8	3
California.....	9	9
Total, United States.....	1,219	680

Members will note that 34 States are involved.

As of March 1, 1956, 193 of these cases had been referred to the United States attorneys for court action.

There is a related problem which could also be solved by this amendment. The law requires the Agriculture Department to measure fields, and the courts have upheld the Department's right to do so. Many farmers, however, consider this an invasion of their property and of their freedom. Their objection is most fre-

quently stated on the grounds that they do not sell wheat. They use it on their own farms for their poultry, dairy herd, or hogs. We are going to have more bad publicity for the Federal farm program as the Department is forced to act against more farmers on this score. Last year there were 57 such cases in Ohio alone. I feel certain, and the Department shares my view, that this resistance to measurement and the consequent conflict between citizen and the Government will fade if no penalty is attached to excess wheat for farm use.

I have read the many arguments of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and his colleagues on the committee who fear that this action would lead to a considerable increase in the production of wheat. The best information and advice I can get leads me to believe the contrary. The complaints come not from people who want to go into large-scale wheat production but from farmers whose historic operations require 3, 4, or 5 additional acres of wheat to balance their rotation and feeding scheme.

It seems to me that it is a shame that any man can face fine and imprisonment for growing something for his own use. I am certain the general public reaction is similar to my own. Insofar as this situation reflects unfavorably upon the entire wheat program, it is in the interest of the constituents of the gentleman from Kansas, and all others who favor the farm program, to correct the injustice.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I do not particularly like this method of approaching a problem of this kind, because it does set an undesirable precedent in saying that funds shall not be used to prosecute a particular offender. This is an unusual situation, however, where these small farmers are being brought into court and assessed a penalty for growing wheat and using it on their own farms. Those of us who are interested in this problem have not been able to get any relief in any other way. I shall, therefore, support the gentleman's amendment because it does accomplish the purpose of relieving the small farmers from this obligation which was never intended, in my judgment, when this law was passed.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his observation. May I say to the gentleman that we have cases in the State of Georgia, for instance, involving an institution down there where they attempted to grow wheat for food for the inmates of the institution, the Monastery, I think it is called. They have been caught in this web. This was grown for their own institution on their own farm. We have many cases of similar nature. We have them in the State of Pennsylvania, we have them in Ohio, where the small farmers are being caught up in this web and brought into Federal court.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I understood the gentleman to say that these people were

charged with a crime. The gentleman does not mean they are charged with a crime. The gentleman understands that these are civil cases to collect penalties, does he not?

Mr. BOW. I understand there is also a criminal penalty.

Mr. KEATING. While it is true it is a civil claim involving a penalty, yet if they do not pay up they might later go to jail.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is correct. Mr. HOPE. They do not go to jail.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They go to jail for contempt. Did you ever hear of that? If you do not obey a court order, you go to jail.

Mr. HOPE. These are civil suits.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. So is a divorce suit; but if you do not pay alimony, you go to jail.

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I was merely going to ask for the regular order. The gentleman from Michigan was getting a little bit involved down there.

Mr. BOW. It seems everyone was getting involved, and that is unfortunate for these small farmers when they find themselves a bit involved. They are greatly involved by the Federal Government coming in and enforcing an order against their free use of the land.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from New York is completely mistaken. I was not speaking for myself. I was not sympathetic toward those folks who do not support their wives and their children. That is all I was thinking of.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I do feel that this is one way in which we can protect the small farmer who has been faced with this serious problem, and by the limitation of the use of the fund we now can. We have done it before. We did it for some years in the State of California in the Santa Margarita case. We have a precedent for it. There is ample authority and precedent for it, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment. I have had a great deal of trouble in my State about this very problem. We have people who raise chickens, who feed a few cattle or cows on their place; they raise a little wheat, and, by George, the first thing you know, they are hauled into court because they have raised wheat to feed their own livestock; people who never made a habit of selling wheat; they never sold a bushel of wheat; they planted their own wheat; they harvested their own wheat. They feed it to their own chickens and never a pound of it goes on the market. It never comes off the farm, and the only way they get off the farm is when they haul them up and threaten them with a jail sentence or a fine for raising the food to feed their own family and their own chickens. Is that not absurd? I want to say that I have talked to a num-

ber of members of the Committee on Agriculture who have been sympathetic to this suggestion, and I am informed that in the bill which passed the House, in the conference report, in the late bill that was vetoed, that that provision was in there taking care of these small farmers. I was told by a member of the Committee on Agriculture who was for the proposal that it was contained in that conference report.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Those people will not be brought into court or be haled up unless they are violating the law; is that not correct; a law passed by this Congress?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We want to make an exception to the law to say a fellow can raise at least enough wheat on the farm to feed himself and his family and his chickens.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You are only making an exception for one item, that is all, by this amendment. I am surprised that the gentleman from Virginia would want to evade a law passed by this Congress, by holding up the funds necessary to enforce the law.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, as I understand the amendment, all I want to do is to let this fellow feed his chickens, his cattle, and his family. If this amendment does that, I am for it. If it does not, I want one that does.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the gentleman should become acquainted with what the amendment does, because it does not do what I think the gentleman thinks it does. It only applies to one item.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, I have great confidence in the gentleman from Missouri, and I hope he will offer an amendment to the amendment which will straighten that out.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. This amendment simply says that none of the funds appropriated for the Department of Justice shall be used to prosecute these little fellows that feed wheat to their own stock and their own poultry, and the result of it is that, if we adopt this amendment, Congress has spoken and has in effect amended the congressional intent which now, as it reads, would cause these people to be subject to a penalty.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I would like to read the exact language:

When the entire crop of wheat grown on the farm is to be used for seed, feed or food on such farm.

That does just what the gentleman said he wanted done.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That sounds like plain language to me.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the wrong way to amend legislation. I think every one of us will agree to that. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], a distinguished lawyer, has said that he did not like this way of approaching the matter, and I do not believe any lawyer or any Member of the House for that matter would believe that this back-door method is the right approach.

But I am not going to talk any more about that. I want to go to the merits of the question which is basically involved here. It is charged that there are a lot of small farmers who are being criminally prosecuted and fined because they grew more than 15 acres of wheat.

That is not the fact. These are civil cases to collect penalties from farmers who have exceeded their marketing quotas. The law, as a matter of fact, is very generous. It provides that any farmer who has never grown a bushel of wheat on his land before may grow 15 acres of wheat without paying any penalty whatever. Members know that with the use of fertilizer this means from 400 to 500 bushels of wheat that may be grown even with moderate yields. This provision was placed in the law to protect the non-commercial wheat growers. It does protect him adequately. Do not tell me that a man who grows more than four or five hundred bushels of wheat is a small farmer who is not engaged in commercial operations.

In addition to that, he may grow all the corn, and all the rye, and all the barley, and all the oats that he wants for food and livestock feed, because there are no marketing quotas on any of these crops. So no one is suffering; no one is being persecuted. No criminal offense is being charged, nor can there be. These are simply civil suits and you would be surprised, perhaps, if I told you, in view of all the furor that we have had here today, that there were only 1,219 of these cases in 1954 and only 680 cases in 1955 out of over a million and half wheat growers in the United States. By this I mean that, according to figures furnished the Committee on Agriculture by the Department, there were only this number of cases in each of these years in which marketing quota penalties were incurred where all the wheat produced on the farms was used solely for food, seed, and feed. In most of these cases the penalties have been or will be collected by administrative action. As of March 1, 1956, only 143 suits had been filed. In all probability most of these cases will be settled without trial since the law is clear.

Now, in order to prevent the United States district attorneys from doing their duty under the law, this amendment is suggested to save a few farmers from paying a civil penalty because they grow more than the 15 acres of wheat which the law permits them to grow without any penalty when marketing quotas are in effect. Why adopt this method which everybody agrees is the wrong way of approaching this matter in order to save a few farmers from paying the penalty which they have incurred. Is this fair to the more than a million and a half farmers who grew wheat and stayed within

the provisions of the law? In my opinion, if you adopt this amendment, it will mean an entire breakdown of the wheat program.

Let me call attention to the fact that we do not have such a provision in the case of any other commodity under marketing quotas. Producers of cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts cannot exceed their allotments in the slightest degree without paying a penalty, but a farmer may grow 15 acres of wheat where he has no allotment at all.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Under this proposal, what would keep a grower of 10,000 acres of wheat from qualifying?

Mr. HOPE. Nothing in the world. It would break down the program.

Mr. ALBERT. This is not a little-farmer's amendment. It is a big-farmer's amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. These 3 million farmers to whom the gentleman has referred, and those referred to by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] would be subject to this amendment if they fed all of that wheat on their own farm. This amendment is limited to those who use all of that feed on their own farm, and that, in general, would be only the relatively small farmer.

Mr. HOPE. It would have the effect of breaking down the entire wheat program and I think you might be surprised at how many large growers might take advantage of it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact that anybody who is going to feed four or five hundred bushels of wheat in his farm as feed must be in the commercial feeding business? He has probably a flock of 40,000 chickens. He is not feeding simply the old lady's hens with 500 bushels of wheat. And he is not grinding up 500 bushels of wheat to feed the kids flour, either; because there are not any such mills in this country. People buy their flour from commercial mills. You will not find flour being ground in this country to make biscuits and light bread any more. It is a commercial proposition if a man is selling more than the product of 15 acres of wheat.

Mr. HOPE. This in the main is a proposal to bail out a few large poultry growers. That is where most of the support for this proposal comes from. This amendment should be voted down, not only because it is the wrong approach to the matter but because the basic proposition itself has no intrinsic merit.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know I am not immoderately modest when I say that it is pretty well known here in the House of Representatives that I am not a farmer. Being from the sidewalks of New York,



I thought it best to sit back and listen to the highly intelligent and convincing words of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. I could never discuss the subject with the ability of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. I can only add that this is not the right way to attack any problem. The law is on the statute books. It is the duty of the Attorney General to enforce it. This is an around-the-back-door method of trying to upset law enforcement. I do not think this House will approve the pending amendment.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for the gentleman from Kansas and for my distinguished colleague from New York. I, too, have no farmers in my district. We do not raise any wheat, so I am something of a lay observer. However, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the observations of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. I have talked with him, and I am personally in favor of his amendment. I hope the Committee will support it.

Mr. ROONEY. I was under the impression that the Attorney General, whose duty it is to enforce this law which is now on the statute books, was a constituent of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. In the first place, that is quite true, and I am proud of it. In the second place, it is irrelevant. In the third place, I am sure he would be delighted to be relieved of some of his duties.

Mr. KEATING. If the gentleman will yield, along that same line, the Attorney General is a great friend of mine and doing a magnificent job, as the gentleman from New York realizes.

Mr. ROONEY. Which gentleman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]?

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman who is acting as Attorney General, of course. But if we adopt this amendment he will no longer have the duty to enforce this particular phase of the law in this narrow area.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask my good friend from Kansas how many farmers were involved in this setup nationally? Just give me the figures.

Mr. HOPE. Twelve hundred in 1954 and 600 in 1955, as I get the figures from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GAVIN. Evidently most of them must be in my State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. How could this amendment break down this whole picture if it is not affective?

Mr. GAVIN. I am unable to answer my very good, able friend from New York State, but I do know this that the gentleman from Kansas states that the Committee on Agriculture is going to take care of this matter which is so objectionable to many small farmers. Why do you

not take care of it and do something about it? You have had plenty of time to work something out. Why do they make it necessary to come out on the floor of the House with this kind of amendment with which they seemingly are not too pleased.

Let us take a look at the record: 82,000 wheat allotments were established in the State of Pennsylvania. Out of this number there were 737—1954—excess-wheat cases. Of this number 675 satisfied their penalty either by storage or by payment of the penalty. There are 62 cases still unsettled, 47 of which are in the hands of the Attorney General.

Now, up in my district I have a farmer, a good farmer and a good citizen. This farmer who took his case up with me said, "I cannot understand what kind of a Government we have. I am not a big wheat farmer. All I want to do is grow wheat to take care of my family and on my farm to feed my livestock, and so forth. He does not know, with all the regulations heaped upon him, whether he is in the United States or Russia. He said, 'I do not ask for any subsidy. I do not ask for any gratuities. I do not ask anything from the Government. Why does not the Government just leave me alone to run my own farm in my own way?' He does not want any restrictions. He does not want any regulations. He does not want any regimentation. He just wants Uncle Sam to mind his own business and let him do what he wants to do on his farm. But the Attorney General says, 'No, we have a penalty against you and this must be satisfied either by storage or by payment of the penalty.'"

He was allocated 15 acres. But he evidently grew more wheat than the law allowed, and the law said that he shall pay the penalty. Some 675 Pennsylvania farmers did pay the penalty. There are 62 cases still unsettled and there are 47 more that are in the hands of the Attorney General at the time this letter from Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, was written in November of 1955. Therefore, the member of the Committee on Agriculture here today says you are going to upset the equilibrium of the whole agricultural program. So what? This farmer is a good American citizen. He says he does not want anything from Uncle Sam except to mind his own business. He wants to be left alone to take care of his family and his farm. I think he has a good point. It's a matter of principle with him. I too want the Government to cease interfering with the small farmers, with their restrictions, regulations and regimentation that strangle the whole agricultural life of the Nation. I just want to say to the gentleman from Ohio who introduced a very timely amendment that it might cause the Committee on Agriculture to do something about it. Give some relief to the average small farmer, who is a small farmer. The average small farmer wants to do his part. He does not want to violate the law. He does not want to pay any penalty. He just wants to be left alone, to run his farm in his own way. The small farmer has just as much

right as the big commercial farmer or any other farmer in this agricultural picture. If he accepts no subsidies or gratuities from the Government he should be permitted to grow at least that which he uses on his own farm and for his own family but if he were allowed to do that it would interfere with the big production of the big commercial farmer and would cut down his market.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I think it should be pointed out that while there are only 1,200 cases of violations of this provision, there are probably 12,000 farmers in the United States who would like to grow extra wheat strictly for their own feed.

Mr. GAVIN. For their own use on their own farms.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. The importance of this measure is not restricted to just 1,200 farmers.

Mr. GAVIN. I think the small farmer is entitled to be considered if he is not violating the law and going out and selling his wheat in the open market. Here is the chance to help the little farmer who does not ask anything from anybody except to be left alone and be permitted to sow enough for his own farm and family. He asked me, "What kind of legislator are you? Can't you do something about it?" I said, "You do not fully understand the agricultural situation of the Nation. When you get down here, brother, you are in a big agricultural ring and you cannot get very far pleading the case of the small independent farmer." But here comes my friend, the gentleman from Ohio—he offers an amendment that will give some relief to this little farmer. The average small farmer is a good American citizen with a family and he looks after his farm and his family and I am proud of him. He is not asking for any consideration other than that to which he believes he is entitled. He just wants to be left alone and not be restricted and regulated by the Government. We should leave him alone. I say let us support this amendment and possibly the Committee on Agriculture may get busy and do something about changing this law which is working a hardship on the small farmer. Now I ask the Committee on Agriculture, "Why have you not been doing something about it? Now is your chance to show that we can do something about it." Let me say to the Members the day will come when you will regret having passed regulatory laws of restrictions and regimentation on agriculture. If you continue you will have a system and bureaucracy that will tell you what to do, when to do it, and how to do it by the Government. As for me I want no part of it. We did not build America on these kind of programs.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to take any time after the membership quite clearly is ready to vote, but I would point out in spite of all the pleas that have been made in the name of the small farmers if this action becomes the law, or if we set a precedent by adopting this amendment, what is to keep a man from buying a

6,000-acre farm and going in the cattle business and feeding his own wheat to his own cattle? He would be protected under this provision, as I read it. It would mean the complete destruction of the farm program and be an open invitation for a man to have a complete operation. I do not believe the House means to do that.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out that all these people wanted was to be left alone. Just a few moments ago we voted on some amendment about establishing new penal institutions in the United States. As far as I can figure it out not an inmate in any of those penal institutions in the whole United States wanted anything other than to be let alone. He just wanted to be let alone—that is all.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are you classing the farmers with the inmates of these institutions?

Mr. POAGE. I did not classify anybody.

Mr. WHITTEN. Those who are opposed to a farm program want to make it unworkable.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. What would be the reason for having the soil bank or a farm program bill if the farmers might grow all the corn he wanted to feed to his hogs?

Mr. WHITTEN. There would be none.

Mr. GAVIN. If he wants to grow, all right, but what I hear you boys pleading for the small farmers, but under the farm program you are getting into big business. Here is a little small farmer, there are six or seven hundred of them and they have been hailed into court by the Attorney General and they will either have to pay up or go to jail. Sixty-two cases are unsettled and fifty-seven have been settled. They have been threatened if they do not pay.

Mr. WHITTEN. Such enforcement is essential if you are going to keep any farm program. Not only that, but under the amendment here you are inviting all the big farmers to come under it too, because instead of growing corn and selling it they would still grow corn and feed it to their livestock. Then you have no farm program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, I have only spoken 3 or 4 times today. Can I not have 2 or 3 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I make objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is too late.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been introduced by Congressman Bow, which would provide that the funds appropriated to the Justice Department would not be used in the prosecution of farmers who have exceeded the acreage restrictions for the planting of wheat so long as the grain harvested therefrom is used for seed or feed on the premises of the farmer.

I have the honor to represent the 15th District of Ohio and it has been brought to my attention many times that the farmers of that area look with considerable consternation upon a Federal Government which would restrict the activities conducted wholly upon the farm. It is not a question of marketing and adding to the commercial surplus by the Ohio farmer. This unnecessary intervention into their lives and activities is one resembling a dictator nation in saying how the farming process shall be conducted.

On March 2, 1955, I introduced H. R. 4570, a bill which would permit the farmers to raise as much wheat as they could use for seed or feed, notwithstanding acreage restrictions. My reason in offering it was to return to the farmers, freedom of operation which had been taken away from them. Following the introduction of that bill, I received volumes of mail expressing approval at the action I had taken and the hope that the Committee on Agriculture would consider such legislation favorably.

On June 1, 1955, the Committee on Agriculture held a hearing on my bill and other similar bills. Many members of this body have joined in this strike for agricultural freedom by introducing similar bills. The Secretary of Agriculture has expressed approval. The President of the United States as one of his nine points for an agricultural program, advocated the enactment of such legislation.

Nothing came of the hearing in 1955—the committee failed to act. Early in 1956, advocates of similar legislation were again given the opportunity to appear before the Agriculture Committee but no serious action has followed.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], in offering this amendment, has recognized the problem which exists in his district and in mine, in our State of Ohio, and the other general farming States of our country. Its adoption would mark a step forward in the direction of the bill which I have introduced and I trust that other members of the Committee and the House will agree that they will support this measure. I hope they will also conclude that the time will not be far distant when the Committee on Agriculture will realize the desires of the people and of the Congress and will conduct further hearings on the so-called wheat bills and

will grant the relief requested and return to the farmers of America, freedom of operation which, to them, is entirely just and deserving.

May I point out that the people of the 15th District have recently given expression of their opinion on this particular question and asked by me in a questionnaire; 3,915 replies were received to this question—3,110 favorably or 79.6 percent of the poll sample favoring this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the Chair rule that my objection came too late?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so ruled. Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Would a preferential motion be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be if it is a preferential motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Would a motion to strike the enacting clause be a preferential motion?

The CHAIRMAN. If in proper form.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 68, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Before the curtain goes down on this bill I think the Members ought to be made aware of the fact that there is provided in this bill \$800,000—I repeat, \$800,000—for representation allowance, and I think most of you know what that means; it is largely for whiskey, cocktail parties, entertainment.

On page 3 of the bill, line 17, it is provided that out of the millions of dollars here appropriated to the State Department and the various agencies connected with it, ice and drinking water for use abroad will be furnished. Apparently with \$800,000 for "entertainment" the water is going to have something added.

On page 5, if you care to see where this money is provided in the bill, line 20, there is a \$700,000 representation allowance and on page 9, under International Organizations and Conferences, there is provided another \$100,000. I was very much interested in reading the hearings on this bill to find out that \$44,857 will go for liquor for United States nationals who are loaned to NATO. Who they are, I do not know, but they are going to get \$44,857.

Then on page 628 of the hearings we find "hospitality expenses of the United Nations" which means there is another \$50,000 for entertainment, including liquor, for the "poobahs" of the U. N.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Would it be possible that the hundred thousand or fifty thousand the gentleman is talking about



is going to be used for making these tariff arrangements over there in Geneva?

Mr. GROSS. I would not be surprised if some of it would be used for that purpose.

During the hearings, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] questioned Mr. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State, concerning these cocktail parties and Mr. Henderson replied to him that "we do not call them cocktail parties, we call them afternoon receptions."

Then reading on page 460 of the hearings we find under answers elicited by questions of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] that in the European area gin costs from \$1 to \$1.50 a bottle, and scotch whisky about \$2 a bottle. With \$800,000 plus—I do not know how much more of that money is distributed throughout the bill—they can buy a lot of liquor at those prices. Yes; at the prices they pay overseas the striped pants boys are going to get an awful lot of liquor because it was also developed in the testimony that they have been spending only about \$5,000 out of this fund for ceremonial wreaths. In other words, about \$5,000 out of \$800,000 will go for ceremonial wreaths. The rest of it will go for cocktail parties and what will you have.

I do not know whether the junketing delegations last summer left any counterpart funds in foreign countries, but if they did the committee should have directed them to buy some of this booze out of counterpart funds, instead of the taxpayers putting up \$800,000 in brand-new money, and that is a minimum, for these cocktail parties.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, one of the outstanding young Members of the House.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to compliment the gentleman for the statement he has made and I want to associate myself with his remarks. On the basis of my own observations, made while traveling in other countries, I am of the opinion that our people in those countries spend altogether too much money on entertainment and especially with regard to the whisky and cocktails referred to by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa. If my memory serves me correctly, it seems that when Khrushchev and Bulganin went to Burma, India, and Afghanistan last fall, these smiling despots made it clear that there would be no whisky served at official functions. The two buffoons were, of course, hypocritical in observing fundamental tenets of the religions in countries they visited, but perhaps they showed some good sense, after all, and it might be well if we would start showing greater respect for the peoples of other lands whose religions militate against the drinking of alcoholic beverages. Islamism, for example, strictly forbids the use of alcoholic beverages, but does our Government instruct its people in the Foreign Service to observe this basic religious principle in Moslem countries? No, and one cannot blame these people for wondering if we Americans really have any religious

principles to which we faithfully adhere. Furthermore, our actions contribute to the growing impression abroad that we are just a bunch of Epicureans, out for a good time and with plenty of money to burn. Let the State Department instruct its people to serve orange juice and ice water and cut out the cocktails. This would constitute a saving of several hundred thousands of dollars to the American taxpayers, and it would cause our enemies and friends alike to have a greater respect for us, and perhaps we would start gaining ground instead of losing it everywhere in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. I would just like to say this: Last year there was appropriated \$575,000 for the State Department for exactly this same purpose. This year we can readily find \$800,000. That is stepping up the liquor bill pretty fast, in my opinion.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Gladly.

Mr. BYRD. If I am not greatly mistaken, I feel that some of the people in the embassies would like very much to get along with less spending of money for cocktails themselves, and I hope that if the people in the State Department read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they will pass the word on down to some of these individuals. I had hoped to be on the floor in time to offer an amendment to strike this figure, but inasmuch as I was unable to be on the floor at that time because of a subcommittee meeting, if there is a roll call I intend to vote against the bill as a protest against such an unnecessary item of expense.

Mr. GROSS. And I want the RECORD to show my vote against the bill for the reason of this unthinkable spending of the taxpayer's money for fun, sport, and amusement, and for a number of other reasons.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to announce that it is my intention to ask for a separate vote on the so-called Murray amendment adopted at page 22. I want to point out at this time that in opposing that amendment and bringing this bill before you with the language contained therein, which was stricken by the adoption of this amendment, I was merely carrying to the floor of the House what was given to me by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and the administration, and I intend to ask that we have another vote on it so as to see how many are going to stand up and support the administration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman talks about the administration approving this bill and then he is talking about a member of one of the commissions and not the administration as such.

Mr. ROONEY. He is one of the administrators, and he was a classmate of General Eisenhower at West Point.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The Bureau of the Budget did not pass on the problem

and the Civil Service Commission has not passed on it; not even the committee on the floor of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE IV—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency, as authorized by Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, and the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1431 et seq.), to carry out international information activities, including employment, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of (1) persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed \$120,000), (2) aliens within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General); travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States to and from the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed \$6,000); entertainment within the United States (not to exceed \$1,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by the law of such countries; purchase of space in publications abroad, without regard to the provisions of law set forth in title 44, United States Code, section 322; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; purchase of caps for personnel employed abroad; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; employment of aliens, by contract, for service abroad; purchase of ice and drinking water abroad; payment of excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; cost of transporting to and from a place of storage and the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an employee of the Foreign Service who is assigned to a post at which he is unable to use his furniture and effects, under such regulations as the Director may prescribe; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration, script writing, translation, and engineering services, by contract or otherwise; maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties used for information activities in foreign countries; fuel and utilities for Government owned or leased property abroad; rental or lease for periods not exceeding 5 years of offices, building, grounds, and living quarters for officers and employees engaged in informational activities abroad; travel expenses for employees attending official international conferences, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, but at rates not in excess of comparable allowances approved for such conferences by the Secretary of State; and purchase of objects

for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; \$110 million, of which not less than \$9 million shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 may be used for representation abroad: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personnel effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel, when any part of such travel or transportation begins in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed during the current year: *Provided further*, That funds may be exchanged for payment of expenses in connection with the operation of information establishments abroad without regard to the provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543): *Provided further*, That passenger motor vehicles used abroad exclusively for the purposes of this appropriation may be exchanged or sold, pursuant to section 201 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949 (40 U. S. C. 481 (c)), and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance of each such replacement, except buses and station wagons, shall not exceed \$1,350: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the United States Information Agency is authorized in making contracts for the use of international shortwave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That existing appointments and assignments to the Foreign Service Reserve for the purposes of foreign information and educational activities which expire during the current fiscal year may be extended for a period of 1 year in addition to the period of appointment or assignment otherwise authorized.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the United States Information Agency asked the Appropriations Committee for funds to convert an obsolete Navy aircraft carrier into a floating exhibit ship. The committee has placed a sentence in its report stating that it disapproves this item.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman mean to say that he favors this floating Cinerama?

Mr. JUDD. Certainly.

Mr. ROONEY. At a cost of \$9 a head? Is the gentleman serious about that?

Mr. JUDD. I am perfectly serious about it. I think this is one of the means by which we can perhaps win a few friends around the world instead of losing them as we have done too frequently. We spend millions of dollars at big fixed installations to reach relatively few people. This ship could reach far more and at less total cost.

But in any case I protest this method of legislating. If the committee had

put language in the bill providing that none of the funds appropriated therein shall be used for this particular purpose, then we could offer an amendment to strike out that provision. But I do not like legislation in committee reports. I have protested this procedure on previous occasions, and I protest it today.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should not even attempt to explain the parliamentary situation to the gentleman. But all the gentleman need do, if he thinks that we should pay \$9 a head to show Cinerama to the Cambodians on this flat-top, is to offer an amendment providing the amount deleted in the report. That will put it right before the House for its decision one way or the other.

Mr. JUDD. Putting language in the report is what you might call legislation by intimidation. It is not legally binding, but no administrator who wants to save his skin, I am sure, would defy the gentleman and his subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield further, the language of the report is binding.

Mr. JUDD. I think it could not be held so, legally. But doubtless it is just as effective as if it were in the bill, because no director of USIA who wanted to survive would dare ignore that language in the report.

Mr. Chairman, because this proposal has real merit, I believe, I want to describe it here and express the hope the Senate committee will consider it more favorably.

In the first place, it is not a boondoggle intended to bring fun and games to the Hottentots. It is a bold and imaginative idea to carry the American story to the people of Asia and Africa. Visually and dramatically we could portray American purposes and policies to large audiences in 104 ports of the Far East, Near East, and Africa.

The proposed carrier would be a converted Liberty ship from the mothball fleet with space on the flight deck for a Cinerama theater, seating 2,000 persons. In addition—and this is very important—there would be space for the showing of regular films, for industrial, educational, and cultural exhibits, and closed circuit television.

Among the exhibits would be the basic documents of the American system, such as replicas of the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution. There would be graphic portrayals of many of the basic policies which guide this Nation. The atoms for peace idea and the President's proposal for open skies inspection would be presented. This would be truly an idea ship, not just a showboat. It would be a powerful instrument for telling America's story, for demonstrating our firm desire for peace in the world.

It would be a telling thrust at the international Communist conspiracy which uses any means, any device, to try to convince the world that we are the imperialists, bent on taking over the world. This idea represents communications

and technique which the Soviets could not match.

All of us are familiar with Cinerama and the impression it gives the viewer of being in the middle of a panoramic action. Cinerama stole the show at the trade fairs in Damascus and Bangkok. At Bangkok, the Soviet Union had 242 crates on the fairgrounds. At the last minute, when they saw our exhibit plans, including Cinerama, they did not bother to unpack the crates. They withdrew from the fair.

The United States has always been a Nation successful in selling both commodities and ideas. But we must admit that somehow or other, we have not done so well in the last decade in selling our very greatest ideas—our beliefs in human freedom and the dignity of man. It would be shortsighted in my opinion to deny ourselves the benefit of any imaginative device for selling our fundamental ideas to the world.

President Eisenhower said in a speech recently:

Let us not forget for one instant that when we are putting \$36 or \$37 billion of expenditures every year into arms and armaments, those arms and armaments alone, remember, can never take us forward—they will merely defend what we have got.

But when you talk about something that promotes a business arrangement—trade; when you can talk about something that proposes a better understanding between us and the people of the Mideast or the people of Africa, or anybody else, then you are talking about something constructive, something that yields results over the years to come.

The committee took exception to this ship idea because it might cost as high as \$9 for each person who saw the Cinerama show. This was based on 1 showing a day for 200 days with a maximum audience of 2,000 per showing. However, the Agency estimated that it would be possible to have 2 showings a day of Cinerama for as many as 275 days a year. In addition to the seated audience, many more thousands would unquestionably line the harbor sides and view the showing of Cinerama from neighboring buildings, trees, boats, and so forth. So that the cost would probably be as low as a dollar or two per person who saw Cinerama.

The gentleman from New York derides the proposal because of the per capita cost to each of the viewers. He ignores all the relatives and friends to whom they talk, and how much does he think it costs per capita to kill those who may be arrayed against us as enemies if we do not win their confidence by showing them what we are really like and what we believe in and stand for? One expert on war has estimated that it cost an average of \$50,000 to kill 1 soldier in World War II. Even if \$9 were an accurate figure, how does \$9 per person for selling our ideas via Cinerama and related films compare with the cost of killing at \$50,000 per person? Does anyone here prefer the latter?

I should also point out that the committee in figuring the \$9 cost per person to see Cinerama entirely disregarded the fact that many more thousands of persons would be visting the ship all day long to view the exhibits, closed-circuit



television, regular motion-picture showings, and the like which will also be housed on the ship—and which will also tell America's story in forceful fashion. And the newstories regarding the ship, and the reports to their neighbors of persons who do see the exhibits and the Cinerama, would reach countless millions.

The operation of this ship would be contracted to a private nonprofit organization. Freedoms Foundation, an organization of dedicated Americans who have done so much to make the world aware of the American heritage, has agreed to sponsor the project.

These Americans believe such a mobile instrument of peace and good will would be effective and worthwhile. It would carry around the world the same significance as the Freedom Trains did several years ago to our own people.

I might close with the following quotation from Roscoe Drummond's column in the New York Herald Tribune of March 5:

It has long been fashionable to badger the USIA for trying to do too much too grandly or for attempting too little too cautiously. If it is arresting and original, the USIA is criticized as being too brassy. If it is muted and prosaic, it is criticized as being timid and unimaginative. But most of its critics have little to propose themselves.

In this instance, I believe USIA has been soundly imaginative and I regret the committee has not seen fit to approve the proposal. I hope the omission will be corrected in the other body.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to change the subject a bit and make reference to another program.

I have been much impressed by the extensive testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee in connection with the United States Information Agency's low-priced books program. According to this testimony, we are confronted with a mammoth Soviet machine which turns out a billion books a year promoting Communist doctrine in all languages at little or no cost to the readers. The Information Agency plan to publish significant American books to sell at prices these readers can afford strikes me as one of the most sensible methods to offset the Kremlin's propaganda. According to the testimony, the Agency also has developed the techniques for putting the plan into action. We cannot afford to wait. I strongly urge that we provide the funds to carry out these proposals and make certain that American books are available all over the world to readers of all languages at prices they can afford.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, although I expect to vote in support of this legislation, I am in hearty disagreement with the provisions of this bill which provides for an increase in the compensation for 5 assistant commissioners and 1 district director at the rate of grade GS-16.

There is one gentleman involved who is deserving of an increase in compensation, Mr. Edward J. Shaughnessy, who is a competent public servant in every respect. However, Mr. Shaughnessy was included for the specific purpose of sweetening up a salary increase for Generals Partridge and Howard whose appointment was given legislative license by this House on March 21. At that time, I directed the following question to the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and received the indicated reply:

Mr. VANIK. In the gentleman's statement he points out this employment of the general will not cost the Government any more than \$2,900 per year inasmuch as the general will have to give up his pension.

Mr. VINSON. No. Of course, he gives up his retired pay and we have to pay his salary.

Mr. VANIK. My question is this: Are his retirement rights permanently lost when he gives up the pension?

Mr. VINSON. No—just suspended.

Mr. VANIK. Or does it accrue to him?

Mr. VINSON. No. He loses it during the time he is holding this position for 6 months or 6 years, when the job is over, then his retired pay starts again. Let me say that we had the Commissioner of Immigration before us and we asked him, "How come you cannot go out and employ civil-service people?" He said, "There are two men in my office who are qualified to do this work, but these men will not take this position because they will lose their civil-service status." That is the reason we are forced to do this.

With the understanding that the appointment of the Generals Partridge and Howard would not cost the Government more than \$2,900 per annum in salary, this House passed out this legislation.

It is regrettable that the appointment of these two distinguished gentlemen Generals Partridge and Howard should again become the subject of Congressional debate—but their initial appointment in a civilian governmental department headed by a general followed by this proposal for salary increase constitutes a breach of faith.

I stated on March 21 that the inability of General Swing to find suitable civilian personnel to fill the high offices of Assistant Commissioners of Immigration appears a little like cronyism at its very worst. My opinion of March 21 has been confirmed by the provisions in this bill which grants the generals a pay increase.

The appointment of retired military officials to high offices in the civilian administration of the Government has the effect of discouraging qualified civilian officers from remaining with Government service. If these devoted servants of the Government must serve throughout the years only to have the top positions filled by others, the effect on morale in the Civil Service is depressing. The Immigration Service cannot afford to become a sanctuary for retired generals with special dispensations granted by the authority of Congress. It is the solemn obligation of this Congress through its established committees to further inquire and investigate the obvious futility of General Swing's effort to obtain adequate civilian personnel to fill these important posts. It is indeed strange that a general in charge of a civil function of Government is unable to find anyone else but another general

to fill an important office of confidence and trust. It is also strange that of all the people in Government service, these few should be singled out for a prompt pay raise. If the generals have confidence in only themselves, can we safely repose in them the responsibility of executing broad civilian functions of Government.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the United States and its people have made heavy contributions of their resources to the free nations of the world. This marks a truly historic episode in our foreign relations since the end of World War II. I think it is only proper that the American people should ask themselves what their assistance to other nations has achieved. I know of no program of United States support that has given us a greater return for the money and effort expended than the United Nations system, including its specialized agencies.

Recently I had the privilege, with the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. MERROW, to serve on the United States delegation to the 10th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. On March 29, a report of our activity at the United Nations and our conclusions on what may well be considered the crucial session of the General Assembly was filed. That report contains this statement:

It is urgently necessary that in the future we make far greater use of the United Nations system for foreign aid than we have in the past. This would not mean an increased amount of money appropriated for foreign aid but rather the channeling of a part of existing appropriations through United Nations machinery.

Some will say that such sponsorship does not give us the advertising and good will that bilateral programs provide. However, we would point out that the basic reason for our program of economic assistance is not to purchase affection but rather to strengthen the free world, eliminating the vacuums of weakness into which the Soviet power is trying to move.

We do not, of course, overlook the factor of good will, but the leaders of the nations, even the so-called underdeveloped ones, know where help is coming from, and even though the goods are not clearly identified as of American origin, we believe the people of those countries discern and appreciate our help.

Now what are these multilateral specialized agencies all about, and what have been the results of their labors? My statement of October 18, 1955, to the Economic and Financial Committee of the General Assembly, is a partial answer:

For example, rinderpest, the scourge of the world's cattle population in the Middle and Far East, has in recent years claimed 2 million cattle victims annually. The beginning of the conquest of this disease has been one of the significant achievements of the Food and Agriculture Organization under the technical assistance program. Something important has happened when vaccines which insure immunity against this disease for 2 years are now available at 2 cents an injection instead of, as previously, at \$1 an injection. It does not take much imagination to translate this achievement into terms of human nutrition and a larger income for the farmers concerned.

The war against malaria has produced one of the great victories of the World Health

Organization. It has been frequently described, yet each new step in this struggle is the most important news in the world to the families which no longer have a malaria sufferer in their homes. In some countries the rate of infant infection has been cut almost to zero. In several countries it is now estimated that all the people in malarious areas will be under the protection of DDT within the next few years. Starting from demonstrations by the World Health Organization, governments have been shown how simple the basic technique is and by what means a continuous organization can be maintained for surveillance against further outbreaks.

It is also news that in one Latin American country, where teacher training had been almost nonexistent, there are now more than 2,000 teachers who have attended vacation courses for teachers organized by UNESCO. Another Latin American country can also claim an impressive achievement. In that country, 18,000 farmers and 2,500 women are listening daily in more than 6,000 radio schools, which the government has organized. These people hear broadcasts on such subjects as reading, writing, hygiene, crop cultivation, and care of livestock. After the broadcasts are concluded, each village group discusses the lessons learned with the help of illustrated material which the government has distributed.

It is important and newsworthy that the productivity demonstrations which the ILO has arranged have in certain cases increased factory output by as much as 20 percent, and sometimes by several hundred percent. In a far eastern country, at a training center established by the International Civil Aviation Organization, there are now 300 students attending classes. Under the plan established by the center, 50 licensed copilots will be graduated each year and as many radiomen and mechanics. This is a form of investment—investment in people—and there is no richer source of wealth available to a country.

Mr. Chairman, it is not always easy to see the tangible returns of the contributions which the American people have made in our foreign affairs, but in the multilateral system the raising of standards of living through economic and social developments, the feeding of the hungry, the fight against disease, ignorance and poverty, and the facilitation of communications and the enhancement of man's enjoyment of work and life are all objectives with which I am sure the American people concur wholeheartedly. The multilateral system has played an important part in helping to achieve these objectives and deserves the full support of the Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is there an amendment or a motion before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. Only pro forma amendments.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like simply to say that whereas the committee was unanimous on the bill and unanimous on everything else in the report I did reserve on the cinerama point that the gentleman has just discussed in the well of the House. I have no opinion upon it, but I rather regret that a limitation was imposed.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 22, lines 7 to 10, inclusive, strike out "Provided, That the compensation of the 5 assistant commissioners and 1 district director shall be at the rate of grade GS-16" and insert in lieu thereof "Provided."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 75, noes 84.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and seven Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 184, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—179

Abbott	Brown, Ga.	Elliott
Abernethy	Brownson	Ellsworth
Adair	Broyhill	Engle
Alexander	Burdick	Fascell
Alger	Burleson	Fisher
Andresen,	Burnside	Flynt
August H.	Byrd	Forrester
Ashley	Cederberg	Fountain
Ashmore	Chase	Frazier
Aspinall	Chenoweth	Gary
Avery	Chipperfield	Gathings
Bailey	Church	Gentry
Bass, Tenn.	Clark	George
Bates	Colmer	Gregory
Beamer	Cooper	Griffiths
Bennett, Fla.	Corbett	Gross
Bennett, Mich.	Cunningham	Gubser
Bentley	Curtis, Mo.	Hale
Berry	Davis, Ga.	Harden
Blatnik	Dies	Hardy
Blitch	Dingell	Harrison, Nebr.
Bolton	Dolliver	Harrison, Va.
Frances P.	Dorn, S. C.	Harvey
Bonner	Dowdy	Hayworth
Bray	Doyle	Henderson
	Durham	Heseltun

Hoeven	Morrow	Schwengel
Hoffman, Mich.	Metcalf	Scott
Hollifield	Miller, Nebr.	Selden
Holt	Morrison	Short
Hope	Moss	Shuford
Huddleston	Mumma	Siler
Jennings	Murray, Tenn.	Sisk
Jensen	Nelson	Smith, Kans.
Johansen	Nicholson	Smith, Miss.
Johnson, Wis.	Norrell	Smith, Va.
Jonas	O'Konski	Talle
Jones, Ala.	Pelly	Thompson,
Jones, Mo.	Perkins	Mich.
Jones, N. C.	Pfost	Thompson, N. J.
Judd	Plicher	Thompson, Tex.
Kearns	Poage	Thompson, Wyo.
Kee	Poff	Tollefson
Kilgore	Priest	Tuck
King, Calif.	Rains	Udall
King, Pa.	Rees, Kans.	Utt
Knox	Reuss	Vanik
Knutson	Rhodes, Ariz.	Van Pelt
Krueger	Rhodes, Pa.	Vinson
Landrum	Richards	Vorrs
Lanham	Rivers	Watts
Lankford	Roberts	Weaver
LeCompte	Robeson, Va.	Westland
Lesinski	Rogers, Colo.	Whitten
Lovre	Rogers, Fla.	Wier
McDowell	Rogers, Mass.	Williams, Miss.
McIntire	Roosevelt	Winstead
McMillan	Rutherford	Wright
Macdonald	Sadlak	Younger
Mack, Wash.	St. George	Zablocki
Meador	Saylor	

NAYS—184

Addonizio	Fino	Multer
Albert	Flare	Murray, Ill.
Allen, Calif.	Flood	Natcher
Andersen,	Fogarty	Norblad
H. Carl	Forand	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Ford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Anfuso	Frelinghuysen	O'Hara, Ill.
Arendis	Gavin	O'Neill
Auchincloss	Gordon	Osmer
Baker	Granahan	Ostertag
Baldwin	Gray	Passman
Bass, N. H.	Green, Pa.	Patman
Baumhart	Hagen	Patterson
Becker	Hand	Philbin
Belcher	Harris	Polk
Betts	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Boggs	Healey	Preston
Boland	Hill	Price
Bolling	Hillings	Prouty
Bosch	Hinshaw	Quigley
Bow	Holland	Rabaut
Boyle	Holmes	Radwan
Brooks, Tex.	Holtzman	Ray
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Reece, Tenn.
Bush	Hosmer	Riehlman
Byrne, Pa.	Hull	Riley
Canfield	Hyde	Robison, Ky.
Cannon	Ikard	Rodino
Carnahan	Jackson	Rooney
Carrigg	James	Schenck
Celler	Jarman	Scherer
Cheif	Jenkins	Souder
Christopher	Karsten	Seely-Brown
Clevenger	Kearney	Sheehan
Cooley	Keating	Sikes
Coon	Keogh	Simpson, Ill.
Coudert	Kilday	Spence
Cramer	Kirwan	Springer
Cretella	Klein	Steed
Crumpacker	Kluczynski	Sullivan
Curtis, Mass.	Lane	Taber
Dague	Latham	Taylor
Davidson	Lipscomb	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	Long	Thomas
Dawson, Utah	McConnell	Thompson, La.
Delaney	McCormack	Thornberry
Denton	McDonough	Trimble
Derounian	McGregor	Van Zandt
Devereux	McVey	Velde
Diggs	Mack, Ill.	Wainwright
Dixon	Madden	Wharton
Dodd	Magnuson	Wickersham
Dollinger	Mahon	Widnall
Donohue	Mailliard	Wigglesworth
Donovan	Marshall	Williams, N. J.
Dorn, N. Y.	Martin	Wilson, Calif.
Edmonson	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Evins	Miller, N. Y.	Wolcott
Fallon	Mills	Yates
Feighan	Minshall	Young
Fenton	Morano	Zelenko
Fernandez	Moulder	

NOT VOTING—70

Allen, Ill.	Bolton,	Brooks, La.
Barden	Oliver P.	Buckley
Barrett	Bowler	Budge
Bell	Boykin	Byrnes, Wis.



Carlyle	Hébert	Phillips
Chatham	Herlong	Pillion
Chudoff	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Cole	Hiestand	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Hoffman, Ill.	Scrivner
Dawson, Ill.	Johnson, Calif.	Shelley
Deane	Kean	Sheppard
Dempsey	Kelley, Pa.	Sieminski
Dondero	Kelly, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Eberharter	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Friedel	Laird	Staggers
Fulton	McCarthy	Teague, Tex.
Gamble	McCulloch	Tumulty
Garmatz	Machrowicz	Vursell
Grant	Mason	Walter
Green, Oreg.	Matthews	Williams, N. Y.
Gwinn	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Haley	Mollohan	Withrow
Halleck	Morgan	Wolverton
Hays, Ohio	O'Hara, Minn.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Walter against.  
Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Wolverton against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Laird against.  
Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Tumulty against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Haley against.  
Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Friedel against.  
Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Bowler against.

Mr. Carlyle for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Kean.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Scrivner.  
Mr. Deane with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Budge.  
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cole.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Fulton.  
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Hiestand.  
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Kilburn.  
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Vursell.  
Mr. Morgan with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Pillion.

Mr. PHILBIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLEVENGER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### LOCATION OF JET AIRBASE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding all the clamor, hasty conclusions, and erroneous editorial comment, an examination of the facts justified the location of the jet base at Manistee rather than at Kalkaska, in the same State.

As an example of how editors can misjudge a situation, attempt to reflect discredit upon the people's representatives, read the following editorial from the Grand Rapids Press, captioned "Shameful Decision," then take a glance at my very brief answer to the editor, which might well have been amplified.

The editorial reads as follows:

##### SHAMEFUL DECISION

The House has decided to put the much-debated jet airbase in Manistee County for the poorest of all possible reasons—to save a Member's prestige. The Member is Representative RUTH THOMPSON. Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, of Allegan, gave the whole show away when he referred to her as a "lady in distress."

And Miss THOMPSON has been in distress. The base originally was to be located in Benzie County, which is in her district. Then, because the base seemed likely to interfere with the National Music Camp at Interlochen, the Air Force decided it should be in Wexford County. Wexford also is in Miss THOMPSON's district, but she charged that she had been betrayed and demanded that the base be built in Benzie. Possibly tired of these political maneuvers, the Air Force switched to Kalkaska County, which is not in Miss THOMPSON's district. But the Armed Services Committee—none of whose 37 members is from Michigan—decided the base should be transferred to Manistee, which is in Miss THOMPSON's district.

Now the House—or, at any rate, 85 Members of it—has approved the committee's choice. Before going any further we should point out that only 137 Members voted on the move. The 85 who voted for it constitute only 18 percent of the House's total membership—and obviously it isn't the best-informed 18 percent of the House.

The Fifth District's own Representative, GERALD R. FORD, Jr., produced evidence showing that it will be more costly to place the base at Manistee than at Kalkaska. But his colleagues—85 of them, anyway—weren't interested. The Press' Washington correspondent, William F. Pyper, writes that "there could be no doubt, despite conflicting sta-

tistics, that the weight of the argument was in favor of Kalkaska." But, he goes on to say, sympathy was with Miss THOMPSON.

It seems incredible that any Member of Congress would interfere even for a moment in defense matters merely for the sake of saving another Member's feelings. But there it is. Actually 85 Members, speaking for the entire House, have done just that.

The only real argument the 85 raised in defense of their position, and it first was broached by Miss THOMPSON, was that the base should be located in her district because the executive branch of the Government had promised to put it there.

That is completely ridiculous. The only consideration in deciding where an airbase is located should be this: Where will it best serve the purposes of national defense at the least cost?

The Air Force finally decided in this case that the answer was Kalkaska. So far as we can see, the answer still is Kalkaska.

#### CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., April 24, 1956.

EDITOR, THE GRAND RAPIDS PRESS,

Grand Rapids, Mich.

DEAR SIR: Attention was just called to the editorial "Shameful Decision" in the Grand Rapids Press, in which, among other things, you state that I "gave the whole show away when he (I) referred to her (RUTH THOMPSON) as a 'lady in distress.'"

You add that your reporter, William F. Pyper—who I greatly respect—wrote that "there could be no doubt, despite conflicting statistics, that the weight of the argument was in favor of Kalkaska." Well, Bill was not called upon to vote on the proposition and the responsibility of deciding which was the better location for the base is but a matter of opinion. Certainly none of us who know him underestimate his ability to express an opinion even though he is a reporter, not an editorial writer nor a commentator.

Then you add "It seems incredible that any Member of Congress would interfere even for a moment in defense matters merely for the sake of saving another Member's feelings. But there it is. Actually, 85 Members, speaking for the entire House, have done just that." That charge is a most unworthy one and it is unfair, for neither you nor Mr. Pyper have any way of actually knowing what influenced the vote of each individual Member. Unless all Members of the Congress are to be discredited, why should you assume that the 85 who voted against the amendment had an unworthy personal motive—that the 52 who were present and voted for it were right.

I can understand your desire to support your local Congressman, who is a very fine, conscientious, hard-working Member, but there is no certainty that he is always right on every proposition which he advocates.

During the debate I did state "But here is a lady in distress because of the action of the Secretary of the Air Force. There is merit in her claim." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6234.) I did state (p. 6254), that the real issue was whether, when the departments gave us their word, based upon their investigation and their judgment, the Department was to be held to its decision, or whether willy-nilly, for any reason or no reason at all, the Department was to be permitted to switch from one base to another.

During the debate, I said (p. 6234) that I had expected to go along with FORD because from his statement to me, I had understood that there would be a saving if the base was kept at Kalkaska. Subsequent investigation and a reading of the testimony taken before the members of the Armed Services Committee where 23 members voted for, but 5 (and I think 4 of them by proxy) voted against locating the base at Manistee,

indicated that the figures furnished by the Air Force were not accurate.

The Air Force in the first instance came up after a full and complete investigation with a decision that the base should be located in Benzie County. Then it switched to Kalkaska and the Armed Services Committee, which has jurisdiction over all three branches of the armed services and which is a legislative committee and which investigated every phase of the project, decided that it should be moved to Manistee.

Mr. Ford is on the Appropriations Committee, not on a legislative committee. A rule of the House forbids the writing of legislation in an appropriation bill. Any other rule would tend to utter confusion in House procedure because it would permit the Appropriations Committee to come up with legislation which had not by that committee received proper consideration but it had received consideration in a public hearing by a legislative committee, such as the Armed Services Committee.

In the judgment of the Armed Services Committee, in my own judgment, there would be neither delay nor impairment of our national defense by the location of the base at Manistee nor would there be a waste of public funds.

Just why is it that some editors, some columnists, some commentators, some publishers have formed the habit of so often attributing to members of the State legislature or Congress an unworthy or improper motive when the legislator's action is not in accord with the opinion of the publisher or writer? Twenty years' experience here causes me to wonder why it is that publishers and commentators who so frequently insist, sometimes habitually, that the individuals selected by the people to represent them either in Lansing or in Washington, know so little, are so dumb, that they themselves do not stand for public office.

Most of us at least make an effort to ascertain the facts, the merits of any and every proposition that comes up, and then just support the measures which we think are for the best interests of all the people.

Undoubtedly much of the money that is appropriated for the armed services is wasted due to the magnitude of their operations, the necessity of being always prepared, the desirability of experimentation with improvement in mind. It cannot be otherwise. So it is that many of us who do not possess an overall, accurate knowledge of everything which comes under the jurisdiction of the armed services go along, unless our own investigation dictates to the contrary, with the legislative committee charged with making an exhaustive study, an accurate report.

For your convenience I am enclosing a marked copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing just exactly what I did say. Of course, I assume no responsibility for the remarks of other Members or as to the reasons given by them for their action.

Sincerely yours.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON NURSING SERVICES

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include pertinent excerpts from letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been some time since I have called the attention of this body to my bill, House Joint Resolution 485, for the establishment of a National Commission on Nursing Services.

During the interval I have been in touch with hundreds of people, all over the country, people qualified by position and by experience to judge the merits of this proposal. They are hospital administrators, nurses, doctors, educators, and people in public life.

I include as a part of my remarks a few pertinent excerpts from letters which they have written on this subject:

REASONS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON NURSING SERVICES—EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS RECEIVED ON THIS SUBJECT BY HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, OF OHIO

Certainly your Commission could do a great deal to produce greater public understanding and stimulation of important measures to benefit nurses and nursing and increase nurse recruitment. (The executive secretary of a hospital board.)

I feel very strongly that such a Commission as you have recommended is a must if we are to correct or solve the serious situation in the nursing profession. (A hospital administrator.)

It would appear that a Commission established to make a study of the problems, could bring about some uniformity of thinking on the education, utilization of talent, and financing of nursing and its many other facets as related to service needed. I would heartily endorse the establishment of such a Commission. (A hospital administrator.)

I feel such a Commission as you propose would be of great help in getting to the foundation of the nursing problem today. (The executive secretary of a district nurses' association.)

I want to express my appreciation for your leadership in developing such a constructive measure. I feel that the nursing profession needs that interest and support which your bill receives from many groups. (The director of a school of nursing.)

We find it to be the only key offered, up to now, to open new channels to some very serious problems in the hospitals and nursing, particularly bedside nursing. I feel that if this Commission is established, it will in reality serve a great need. (A registered nurse.)

The strength of your resolution, it seems to me, is not so much that it calls for another study but the hope that it gives that nurse practitioners and educators and members of the legislative and executive branches of Government may sit down together to find solutions to these problems. (A university professor of nursing.)

Your recent efforts to establish a Commission to study nursing service needs is a logical and indirect approach to nursing education problems where all the troubles lie—maybe not at the present time, but certainly in the future. (A hospital coordinator of nursing education.)

I am in approval with your proposal for a National Commission on Nursing Services. For the Commission to have representation as you suggest is excellent. I find nurses alone, in an attempt to cope with the problems, are not seeing the overall picture of today. (A hospital administrator.)

When I reviewed the bill, some weeks ago, I felt that here was a splendid opportunity to deepen and broaden the scope of nursing research, and perhaps, to infuse new viewpoints into the solution of long-standing problems. Most of the nurses with whom I have discussed the project concur on the desirability of establishing a National Commission for Nursing Services. (A director of a State university.)

It is the opinion of this group that a study of nursing should be made by qualified and unbiased people, since it is obvious that nurses themselves seem to have difficulty in arriving at any definite agreement or recommendation. (A registered nurse.)

As a hospital administrator, I realize daily the growing shortage of nurses and the need for something to be done on a national level in such a concrete form as this proposed Commission to meet the national shortage of nurses. It has been brought very forcibly to my attention in my own institution where we were forced last June to close one floor of the hospital because of lack of nurses. This situation exists in hundreds of rural and urban hospitals throughout the country and with needed hospital expansion programs the condition will become worse unless steps are taken to remedy them. (A hospital administrator.)

The hospitals of this country have been faced with a shortage of nurses in all categories during or since World War II. There have been many efforts by affected organizations and agencies to meet this shortage and the success of these efforts has been in many cases temporary and inconclusive. I feel that this is a problem of national significance and, therefore, the answer should be sought on a nationwide basis. The commission as provided under Representative Bolton's bill would apparently accomplish this much needed study and possibly provide the answer for our problem. (A hospital administrator.)

This is an increasing national problem, and it would seem from the magnitude of the study that must be performed, and the necessity that such research be detached from any particular organization or association, that it can be competently performed by the Commission that is suggested in the bill. (A hospital administrator.)

Past studies of the situation have been made without offering relief, and it is our thought that a Commission on Nursing Service would produce a report of the situation free from the divergent views which have been common in the past. (A hospital administrator.)

I believe a Commission would definitely accomplish much more than any professional or lay organization could accomplish. (A doctor.)

I am in complete accord with Congressman Bolton's estimate of the situation as being urgent and requiring the services of a Capitol Commission to determine what steps are needed to correct this sad situation. I should like to stress that I am not in the habit of writing letters to Congressmen but this matter is so urgent that I would like to have you know that I and a good many of my medical colleagues are very much in favor of the proposed commission on nursing services. (A doctor.)

There is an urgent need for a National Commission on Nursing Services to study nursing problems by the scientific methods and to recommend constructive courses of action in legislature, education, and in hospital administration. This resolution is of paramount importance to the health and welfare of the American people whom we serve. (A registered nurse, director of nursing service.)

The proposed Commission on Nursing Services would be representative of the executive and legislative branches of Government, of the medical and nursing professions, and of the general public and would, through its composite interests and aims, concentrate its efforts in endeavors to alleviate the current nursing shortages; insure equities of opportunities and advancement in the nursing fields; and assure a comprehensive educational program for adequate national nurse coverage in succeeding years. (A doctor.)

The official nursing organizations have apparently not been able to secure the support from, or representation to the public of their services or their needs. Nursing services that are competent and in sufficient quantity to meet the need of society are of the greatest importance today. Since pressures within the group and outside groups



who have vested interests in this field make constructive and farseeing, realistic measures almost impossible, a Commission whose members can see needs as well as resources objectively and can present their finding to the public can best serve in opening avenues designed to meet the needs of the country as well as its nurse citizens. (A registered nurse, assistant professor of nursing education in a university.)

The health and welfare of the American people is a concern of all the people. Whenever a condition exists that materially affects all the people it becomes the duty of our National Government to do all within its power to correct such a situation. We are concerned about our natural resources in every other respect and the health of our people is a great natural resource. The nursing situation—number needed, salaries, and skills is cause for a study such as proposed in Mrs. BOLTON's bill. (A school superintendent.)

The public questions factfinding by organizational groups whom they feel may have vested interests in outcomes. A broadly representative commission can avoid such reaction and give more effective consideration to the problems of nursing services for the public. (The dean of a school of nursing.)

Through the mechanism of a commission some centralized thinking from interested groups can be crystallized. To me, it is the old story of getting people together around the green table to talk over common problems. (A director of a university clinic.)

The advances in medical sciences have revolutionized the care and treatment of the sick and suggested methods of further preventing illness. Therefore, there needs to be a reevaluation of the amount and kind of nursing services needed in line with these developments. (A director of public health.)

There are so many facets to the total nursing problems of today that I feel it is to our (nursing) advantage as well as that of the patient, that these problems be thought out and worked out in cooperation with the representatives from all groups concerned. This is the goal of the proposed Commission on Nursing Service. After all is said and done, isn't the patient the real reason for the nursing profession being in existence at all? Shouldn't he have a voice in the matter of his care? Of how his money is spent? I feel that the patient should have this representation on the Nursing Commission. (A registered nurse, director of nursing service.)

#### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit while the House is in session tomorrow, during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### SHIP-SUBSIDY PROGRAM AND NEW SHIP CONSTRUCTION

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during my service as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have come to several very definite convictions. First, it is impos-

sible for vessels flying the American flag to compete on an equal basis with foreign competitors without Government assistance. The officers and crews aboard our ships receive four times as much in wages as the officers and crews of foreign ships. These wage scales are entirely justified and are only sufficient to permit these men to maintain the standard of living enjoyed by the American workingmen in other forms of industry.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 we do provide for subsidy assistance in the operation of American-flag vessels, but only in connection with service on essential trade routes. Today there are 31 of these routes and some 16 American companies receiving subsidy aid under title VI of the 1936 act. But in the foreign commerce of the United States an American-flag vessel is at just as much disadvantage in competition with foreign-flag vessels whether the voyage takes place over an essential trade route, or whether it is in the nature of a tramp-type operation, or pursuant to a specific contract of affreightment.

During the hearings by the Merchant Marine Committee recently held on the cargo preference law, under which 50 percent of aid cargoes must be transported in United States-flag vessels, it was forcefully brought out that our tramp fleet, which today is composed of some 70 vessels, would immediately disappear from the seas if they are not assured of at least 50 percent of the bulk cargoes financed with United States Government moneys. This, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me, is not the proper way to subsidize any portion of our American merchant marine. We should call a spade a spade; and if the tramp segment and other contract carriers are essential to a strong American merchant marine, we should provide direct and open subsidy assistance.

The shipbuilding facilities of this country are equally as essential to the national defense as the existence of a fleet of fast, modern merchant vessels. The 70 vessels in the tramp fleet today are slow, 10-knot Liberty ships. The foreign tramp owners are building new, modern and much faster vessels. During a trip which I took to Europe last summer as a member of a subcommittee of the Merchant Marine Committee, I saw new building in all the yards of Western Europe, many of the vessels designed for the tramp trades. Under existing conditions, even though business today is at peak levels for the tramp owners, there is not the slightest prospect for any of our tramp vessels to be replaced and they are doomed to wither on the vine, so to speak. When they reach the age when they no longer can be operated economically, our tramp fleet will disappear unless some direct Government assistance is provided.

In view of these circumstances, I am about to introduce a bill which would provide the type of assistance which I believe not only justified from a national economy standpoint, but imperative from the standpoint of national defense. The bill would provide for an operating-differential subsidy only for new vessels to be constructed for the bulk cargo

trades. It would provide, however, for subsidy being paid on any old vessels during the period of construction of the newer, modern, and more suitable types. I feel that only when we face up to the problem in the manner reflected by this bill will we be approaching the type of American merchant marine which this country so richly deserves.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. KELLY of New York (at the request of Mr. KLEIN), for Wednesday, April 25, 1956, on account of illness.

Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), April 24 to April 27, 1956, on account of illness in the immediate family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. HILL, for 45 minutes, on Wednesday, May 2, 1956.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. FERNANDEZ.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COUDERT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in two instances and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS, his remarks today, and to include a letter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. HARDY and to include an address by Mr. BONNER.

Mr. VELDE.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the

following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4047. An act relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4781. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Forces, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 24, 1956:

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung;

H. R. 1179. An act for the relief of Salih Houli, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozele Rose Hardoon;

H. R. 2796. An act for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel;

H. R. 2948. An act for the relief of Guglielmo Joseph Perrella;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey;

H. R. 3276. An act for the relief of George S. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritsellis);

H. R. 4466. An act for the relief of Lois O. Jennings;

H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Antonio Penna;

H. R. 4909. An act to authorize the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York;

H. R. 5310. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla.;

H. R. 6078. An act for the relief of Alison MacBride;

H. R. 7058. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997), in respect of the compensation of supreme court justices and circuit court judges;

H. R. 8728. An act to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service;

H. R. 8957. An act to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10387. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson.

On April 25, 1956:

H. R. 4047. An act relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4781. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 26, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1781. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1782. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Mrs. Viola H. Montgomery, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Muir Woods National Monument, will authorize her to operate a lunchroom, soft-drink counter, souvenir, stationery, and photographic shop for the public at Muir Woods National Monument, Calif., during a 2-year period beginning January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1783. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of Jui-Chang Hsieh, A-7247342, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1784. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Crooked River project, Oreg., pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 387); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1785. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 15, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of a channel from Port Lavaca and Palacios, and the Colorado River, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico. This report is submitted in final response to the authority of the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946, for a preliminary examination and survey for a channel from Port Lavaca and Palacios, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico. It is also submitted in partial response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate adopted September 16, 1948, for a review of reports on the Colorado River, Tex., for a suitable outlet channel to the Gulf of Mexico (H. Doc. No. 388); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENTON: Select Committee to Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Fi-

nancial position of the White County Bridge Commission. Report on investigation of the White County Bridge Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 2052). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. BOLTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 210. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings to the Sudan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2053). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 232. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary; without amendment (Rept. No. 2054). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 10643. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California; without amendment (Rept. No. 2055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8228. A bill to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude bauxite and on certain calcined bauxite; with amendment (Rept. No. 2064). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8615. A bill to provide wage credits under title II of the Social Security Act for military service before July 1, 1959 (the termination date for inductions into the Armed Forces), and to permit application for lump-sum benefits under such title to be made within 2 years after interment or reinterment in the case of servicemen dying overseas before such date; with amendment (Rept. No. 2065). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 415. An act for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders; with amendment (Rept. No. 2039). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 419. An act for the relief of Eli E. Hood; without amendment (Rept. No. 2040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 438. Resolution providing that the bill H. R. 6893, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2041). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3532. A bill for the relief of Seymour Robertson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5591. A bill for the relief of the Ohio Casualty Insurance Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2043). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5691. A bill for the relief of P. R. Markley, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7835. A bill for the relief of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein; without amendment (Rept. No. 2045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.



Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8041. A bill for the relief of Clyde R. Stevens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8867. A bill for the relief of the estate of F. M. Bryson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10006. A bill for the relief of Vincent P. Svelinis; with amendment (Rept. No. 2048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10013. A bill for the relief of Sfc. Henry F. Ferry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10092. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 2050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10191. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Cook Cleland; without amendment (Rept. No. 2051). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7702. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji; without amendment (Rept. No. 2056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 228. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 767. An act for the relief of Andrew Rosner; with amendment (Rept. No. 2058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 885. An act for the relief of Alice Elizabeth Marjoribanks; without amendment (Rept. No. 2059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1111. An act for the relief of Eric A. Cummings; with amendment (Rept. No. 2060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1883. An act for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1970. An act for the relief of Kim Boksoon; with amendment (Rept. No. 2062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 606. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2063). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4141. A bill for the relief of Vivencio Fernando Raymundo; with amendment (Rept. No. 2066). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:  
H. R. 10783. A bill to amend section 314 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 10784. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 10785. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10786. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 10787. A bill to establish a program of production controls for hogs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 10788. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 10789. A bill providing for payment by the United States of ocean or air freight charges on certain relief packages shipped to foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 10790. A bill to provide for the rank of certain officers of the Army, Navy and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10791. A bill to provide that the chairmanship of the Federal Trade Commission shall rotate among the Commissioners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 10792. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 10793. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 10794. A bill to provide for an annual report by the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to certain timber resources of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 10795. A bill to provide a library of captioned films for the deaf and hard of hearing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 10796. A bill providing for payment by the United States of ocean- or air-freight charges on certain relief packages shipped to foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 10797. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 10798. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens

of the United States who have lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election or plebiscite held in occupied Germany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 10799. A bill to provide that the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board establish and maintain Government liquor stores in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10800. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize payment of operating-differential subsidy to contract carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 10801. A bill relative to processing of donated food commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 10802. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of streams at and in the vicinity of Gulfport, Fla., for present and prospective commerce and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 10803. A bill to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 10804. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10805. A bill authorizing and directing the construction by the Atomic Energy Commission of six nuclear power facilities for the production of electric power; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10806. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 10807. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 10808. A bill to adjust an inequity that exists with respect to certain technical, scientific, industrial, professional, merchandising and marketing periodicals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 10809. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 10810. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 10811. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 10812. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10813. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. J. Res. 610. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 10814. A bill for the relief of Willem Fransen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 10815. A bill for the relief of Maria Ragusa Chiapetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 10816. A bill for the relief of Lillian Ida Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10817. A bill for the relief of Dr. Thomas B. Meade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10818. A bill for the relief of George T. Moore and Carl D. Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 10819. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to the descendants of James H. Haney, Bledsoe, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 10820. A bill for the relief of Alexandra Vassilievna Ghermanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10821. A bill for the relief of Ezra Dweck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 10822. A bill for the relief of Maria G. Connolly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 10823. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive Zaudie Makuria, a citizen and subject of Ethiopia, for instruction at Annapolis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10824. A bill for the relief of Sonja Spieker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 10825. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Joseph Welch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 10826. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles O. Fairbank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 10827. For the relief of Melvin Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10828. A bill for the relief of Maitland McKinley Joseph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

955. By Mr. BOW: Petition of Mildred Carter and others, of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I

veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

956. Also, petition of Fred L. Ickes and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

957. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 22 members of Post No. 172, the American Legion, Jasonville, Ind., in support of H. R. 7886, a bill to increase pensions to World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

958. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of the department of Pennsylvania executive committee, the American Legion, urging enactment of necessary legislation to declare November 11, now known as Veterans Day a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

959. By Mrs. CHURCH: Petition of the City Council of the City of Waukegan, Ill., urging that the Congress include in any Federal highway construction legislation the requirement that in every highway project where Federal funds are used, to make it possible for municipal governments to be reimbursed for all changes to its water and sewer facilities required by such projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

960. By Mrs. KEE: Petition of Mrs. Carolyn Barosky, president, Wood-Venable Auxiliary 8519, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Kimball, W. Va., and 9 other members of Wood-Venable Auxiliary 8519, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

961. Also, petition of John F. Boyd, of Alderson, W. Va., and 43 other residents of Monroe and Summers Counties, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Criticism of TV and Radio Commercials Is Unjustified

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Ted Rand, general manager of radio station KDRS, Paragould, Ark., regarding recent attacks made against the radio and television industry in the House of Representatives. Mr. Rand is an outstanding business and civic leader. The principal complaint against these media was that both television and radio stations increased the sound volume when commercials were being presented. According to Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, "these excessively loud commercials" applied to networks as well as local programs. Mr. HOSMER asked the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to look into the matter and advise him of the Commission's findings.

Mr. Rand's letter, giving views and observations of an owner and operator of a radio station, is good reading indeed. His letter portrays the value of

radio to a community. I highly recommend that you read it. The full text of Mr. Rand's letter is as follows:

KDRS,

Paragould, Ark., March 31, 1956.

The Honorable E. C. GATHINGS,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GATHINGS: The assaults upon radio by Representative CRAIG HOSMER and others, in my opinion, accent the negative. It seems to me that radio needs something of a champion among Congressmen who will accent the positive.

I feel sure that you appreciate the services which the radio industry has rendered to the Nation. Moreover, I am confident that you have intimate knowledge of the manner in which many Arkansas radio stations relate themselves to their communities.

In our community, we do not merely give lip service to the goals, dreams, problems, and purposes of our people. We roll up our sleeves and pitch in. We devote time, talent, and energy to the building of our community. We try to do our best in support of those groups which are creating happiness within our community—from a home demonstration club's bake sale to a citywide campaign to raise \$100,000 for a new industry.

We have time for our churches, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Red Cross, cancer, nursing home, schools, civic clubs, service clubs, farm groups, and every other similar organization. We rarely receive any direct remuneration from our work on behalf of these groups, although we do feel that our community service policies are directly responsible for our overall successful business operation.

We are typically American in the business sense, and I firmly believe that our industry is suffering unnecessary abuse from some of its critics. While criticisms of specific abuses by a few stations may be completely valid, the tendency to smear them across the entire industry is unfair to many of us.

I sincerely hope that you will find an opportunity to speak up for the great majority of the Nation's radio stations and in defense of the typical small city Arkansas station which builds its entire service around its people and their needs.

If the emphasis remains upon the negative aspects, may I then recommend that someone be equally unfair in appraising other aspects of the American scene which might be loud, noisy, and obnoxious in their own way:

Used car dealers illuminate their lots in a manner which is bright, glaring, and disagreeable to me.

Service stations fly masses of distracting pennants and twirling silver devices. They display huge day-glo signs. They distort the natural beauty of my town.

Magazines cluttered with attention-getters continually force me to turn to page one-hundred-and-something for a continuation of the article I am reading.

Full pages of my newspaper contain nothing but advertising. I find this annoying.

Billboards put to shame the loudest radio commercial I have ever heard. These billboards obliterate the landscape, and they divert my attention from the somewhat important function of operating my automobile.

I pay to see commercials at my neighborhood theater.

Times Square is simply a disgrace.